

**A STUDY OF HIGH LEVEL GREEK
IN THE NON-LITERARY PAPYRI
FROM ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EGYPT**

by
RAFFAELE LUISELLI

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

1999



ABSTRACT

This thesis discusses for the first time the reception of higher level Greek in everyday prose in second- to sixth-century Egypt. It offers insights into the strategies of composition in stylistically ambitious non-literary sources, and investigates the use of select high-level language varieties. It thus contributes to research on stylistic registers in post-classical Greek.

In Chapter One, the objectives of thesis are set out, and the methodologies used in assessing evidence are outlined. Chapter Two explores competence as a prerequisite for good performance. The linguistic characteristics of grammar as taught in contemporary schools are analysed in detail to determine the constituents of language competence of educated individuals. Greek theories of the epistolary style are discussed at length to define the normative stylistic context within which well-educated individuals produced their correspondence.

Chapter Three examines the impact of two high-level language varieties, viz. purism and poetic language. The phenomenon of severe puristic intervention is explored by analysing two test cases. The interaction between attitudes to extreme puristic variants and the weighting of non-puristic elements is discussed, and the existence of widely varied puristic profiles is demonstrated within each genre. Loans from poetic language are shown to be equally subject to various patterns of usage, depending upon either external determinants such as context or the writer's particular psychological motivations.

Focusing on private correspondence, Chapter Four illustrates the main strategies of stylistic refinement from a selection of contemporary letters. The capacity of handling the tools of high level Greek is occasionally inferior to the writers' ambitions, and the selected strategies of refinement differed in conformity with the rhetorical norms proposed by known epistolary theorists. Compositional choices disagreeing with these seem to depend partly on rhetorically-motivated acts, partly on sheer ignorance of the requirements of rhetoric.

CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
List of Tables	5
Acknowledgments	6
A Note on References and Abbreviations	8
(A) Literary and Documentary Texts — Modern Literature	8
(B) General Abbreviations	14
(C) Symbols	15
(D) A Note on the Transliteration of Ancient Names and on Cross-References	15
Chapter One: — <i>Introduction to Materials and Methods</i>	16
1. The Aim of the Present Thesis	17
2. The Primary Evidence	21
3. Methodology	26
3.1. Setting Papyri in Context	27
3.2. Copy, Original, Autograph	29
3.3. Palaeography as Additional Evidence	41
3.4. Some Basic Principles of Linguistic Analysis	44
4. Problems of Terminology	62
4.1. Koine	62
4.2. A Note on Abstract Terms	63
4.3. Written and Spoken Koine	64
4.4. Standard and Colloquial Koine	64
Chapter Two: — <i>Acquiring a Background in Grammar and Rhetoric in Roman and Byzantine Egypt</i>	68
1. The Place of Classical Greek in the Grammatical Education of Pupils in Roman and Byzantine Egypt	69
2. Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Epistolary Style and its Stylistic Variations	85
2.1. Prescriptions on Style	85
2.2. Theories of Stylistic Variation	105
3. Acquaintance with Rhetorical Theories of Letter-Writing in Egypt	111

	<i>page</i>
Chapter Three: — <i>The Use of Select High Level Language Varieties</i>	
<i>in the Non-Literary Papyri from Roman and Byzantine Egypt</i>	113
1. ἀρχαίως καὶ δοκίμως διαλέγεσθαι: the Use of Atticist Purism	114
1.1. Introductory	114
1.2. Analysis of Select Features	119
1.3. Puristic Profiles	144
2. The Use of Poeticisms	189
2.1. Problems of Classification	191
2.2. Patterns of Usage	197
2.3. Self-Satisfaction and <i>Divertissement</i>	206
Chapter Four: — <i>High Level Prose Style in Private Letters from Roman</i>	
<i>and early Byzantine Egypt</i>	214
1. Strategies of Stylistic Refinement	215
1.1. Special Contexts	217
1.2. Generalised Refinement: Ambition and Failure	219
1.3. Generalised Refinement: Ambition and Success	234
2. Rhetorical Theory and Epistolary Performance	248
Conclusion	254
Appendices	260
(A) Bookhands and Lectional Signs in Private Letters	261
(B) A Selection of Papyrus Letters Written in Standard and Low Level Greek	266
Bibliography	281

LIST OF TABLES

	<i>page</i>
1. The Style of Dialogue and Letter-Writing in Demetrius' <i>On Style</i>	91
2. The Position of οὐδέν/ <i>nemo/nullus</i> as an Object in the Sentence	233

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I first developed an interest in post-classical Greek when I was an undergraduate in Rome in the late 1980s, but papyri and their language were alien to me at that time. After graduating, I was able to obtain a postgraduate grant from the Italian Government to enable me to take up a MA studentship at University College London for the academic year 1991/92. There I was introduced into the world of papyrology and into the society of Graeco-Roman Egypt. The inherent potential of papyri for the study of the Greek language attracted me, but I realised immediately that no reliable research, and indeed no significant progress on current scholarship, would be possible without a laborious and time-consuming first-hand analysis of a large bulk of papyrus sources. This led to this thesis. I am grateful to all the staff of the Department of Greek and Latin at UCL and especially to Professors Pat Easterling (at that time still at UCL) and Herwig Maehler for encouraging me to undertake my doctoral studies in London. My research project would probably have not been accomplished without the stimulating environment which I enjoyed in London.

Several libraries and institutions have provided access to their manuscript collections and/or rare printed books: in particular, I wish to thank Dr Revel Coles, Ashmolean Museum (Papyrology Rooms), Oxford; Dr Helen Whitehouse, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; the staff of the British Library, London; Dr Bruce Barker-Benfield and the staff of the Duke Humphrey's Room of the Bodleian Library, Oxford; Drs William Brashear and Günter Poethke, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, Berlin; the staff of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rome; the staff of the Centro Nazionale per lo Studio del Manoscritto, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Rome. The interdisciplinary work required by my project has been made possible by the facilities provided by several libraries in London, Oxford, and Rome. I am most grateful particularly to the staff of the Library of the Institute of Classical Studies in London, the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom, and the Library of the American Academy in Rome for their generous help.

Photographs and reproductions of papyri and Medieval codices have been supplied by several institutions. I am greatly indebted to Dr Coles for so kindly and generously satisfying my countless requests for photographs of the Oxyrhynchus papyri, the property of the Egypt Exploration Society in London, and stored in the Papyrology Rooms of the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford). He has also lent me photographs of a number of other published Oxyrhynchus papyri housed in other institutions. Thanks must also be given to Dr G. Poethke (Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, Berlin), the Department of Antiquities of the Ashmolean Museum,

Oxford; the British Library, London; the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

I am further indebted to Dr Coles for giving me the benefit of his expertise on uncertain readings and problematic interpretations of non-literary Oxyrhynchus papyri. Moreover, I have been fortunate enough to profit from informal discussions with several other scholars, who have also assisted me by their expert grasp of detail, by communicating information on research projects relevant to my work, and by supplying bibliographical material that would otherwise have remained inaccessible to me. I regret that I am unable to acknowledge my debt individually. However, I must single out for special thanks Professor Liliane Bodson (Liege), Professor Pat Easterling (Cambridge), Mr Clemente Marconi (Agrigento), Professor A. Masaracchia (Rome), Dr Dirk Obbink (Oxford), Professor Bruna M. Palumbo Stracca (Rome), Dr Eleonora Tagliaferro (Rome). I am also indebted to Dr Roberta Mazza (Bologna) for allowing me to cite information from her unpublished doctoral dissertation, and to Professors Sebastian Brock (Oxford) and Greg Horsley (Armidale, Australia) for kindly responding to my enquiries.

Finally, I have benefited more than I am able to say from the expert guidance, wise advice, and moral support of my supervisor, Professor Herwig Maehler of University College London. From him I have learned so much. Not only was he the first to introduce me to the technicalities of papyrology, but from his deep knowledge of the classical world I have derived many fascinating insights into the culture and society of Graeco-Roman Egypt and ancient Greek civilisation. His generosity also made it possible for me to examine unpublished Berlin papyri vital to this study. I remain more grateful to him than I can possibly say.

A NOTE ON REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

(A) LITERARY AND DOCUMENTARY TEXTS — MODERN LITERATURE

(i). *Literary texts*. Up-to-date checklists of editions of Greek literary texts are given in *DGE* III xxiii-civ and IV xxiii-xxviii; here and there, however, I have preferred to follow editions not listed therein. Abbreviations for corpora are listed below, (v). If Medieval MSS transmitting *vv.ll.* are quoted by means of sigla, these are the same as those adopted in the edition(s) to which explicit reference is made at the head of or in connection with the passage quoted.

(ii). *Papyri*. Publications of papyri, ostraca and tablets are cited according to J.F.Oates - R.S.Bagnall - W.H.Willis - K.A.Worp, *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, 4th ed. (*BASP* Suppl.7, Atlanta 1992) 1-46. New publications will be abbreviated as follows:

- P. Berl. Lit. = *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin* (*P. Berol. inv.* 21101-21299, 21911), ed. by Grace Ioannidou, photographs by Margarete Büsing (Berl. Klassikertexte 9, Mainz);
- P. Col. X = *Columbia Papyri*, ed. by R.S. Bagnall and D.D. Obbink (*Amer. Stud. in Pap.* 34, Atlanta 1996);
- P. Dubl. = *Greek Papyri from Dublin*, ed. by B.C. McGing (PTA 42, Bonn 1995);
- P. Heid. VII = *Fünfundzwanzig griechischen Papyri aus den Sammlungen von Heidelberg, Wien und Kairo*, hrsg. von A. Papathomas (Veröff. aus d. Heideilb. Pap.-Samml. NF 8, Heidelberg 1996);
- P. Kell. G. I = *Greek Papyri from Kellis : I*, ed. by K.A. Worp in collaboration with J.E.G. Whitehorne and R.W. Daniel (*Oxbow Monograph* 54, Dakhleh Oasis Project - Monograph 3, Oxford 1995);
- P. Oxy. LIX-LXIV = *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London) — LIX: ed. by E.W. Handley *et al.* (*Gr.-Rom. Mem.* 79, 1992); LX: ed. by R.A. Coles *et al.* (*Gr.-Rom. Mem.* 80, 1994); LXI: ed. by T. Gagos *et al.* (*Gr.-Rom. Mem.* 81, 1995); LXII: ed. by J.C. Shelton *et al.* (*Gr.-Rom. Mem.* 82, 1995); LXIII: ed. by J.R. Rea (*Gr.-Rom. Mem.* 83, 1996); LXIV: ed. by E.W. Handley - U. Wartenberg *et al.* (*Gr.-Rom. Mem.* 84, 1997);
- P. Prag. II = R. Pintaudi - R. Dostálová - L. Vidman, *Papyri Graecae Wessely Pragenses* (*Pap. Flor.* 26, Florence 1995)

Abbreviations

Abbreviations for papyrological corpora are listed below, (v).

(iii). *Inscriptions*. Abbreviations for inscriptions may be found in F. Bérard *et al.*, *Guide de l'épigraphiste* (Bibl. de l'Éc. Norm. Sup. 2, Paris 1989) with its *Supplément 1988-1993* (Paris 1993).

(iv). *Journals*. Abbreviations for journals follow the list compiled by P. Rosumek, *Index des périodiques et index de leurs sigles* (*L'Année philologique* 51 [1982] Suppl., Paris 1982). For periodicals published since 1983, see the prefatory lists of *L'Année philologique* 52 (Paris 1983) ff. ; periodicals not included in these lists are cited in a more explicit form.

(v). *Varia*. Here is a list of abbreviations for corpora of both literary and documentary texts as well as for some reference works and instrumenta. Further modern literature is included in the Bibliography.

ACO = *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, ed. E. Schwartz, I-III (Berlin-Leipzig 1927-1940)

ANRW = *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, hrsg. von W. Haase - H. Temporini (Berlin - New York 1972 ff., in progress)

Bauer - Arndt - Gingrich = W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, 4. Aufl. (1952), English translation and adaptation by W.F. Arndt - F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago-Cambridge 1957)

BL = *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten* — I: hrsg. von F. Preisigke (Berlin-Leipzig 1922); II: von F. Bilabel (Heidelberg 1929-1933); III: M. David *et al.* (Leiden 1958); IV: von M. David *et al.* (Leiden 1964); V: von E. Boswinkel *et al.* (Leiden 1969); VI: hrsg. E. Boswinkel *et al.* (Leiden 1976); VII: hrsg. E. Boswinkel *et al.* (Leiden 1986); VIII: hrsg. P.W. Pestman *et al.* (Leiden -New York- Cologne 1992); IX: hrsg. P.W. Pestman *et al.* (Leiden -New York- Cologne 1995)

Blass - Debrunner - Rehkopf = F. Blass - A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 14. Aufl. bearb. von Fr. Rehkopf (Göttingen 1976)

Byz. Not. = J.M. Diethart - K.A. Worp, *Notarunterschriften im Byzantinischen Ägypten* (Mitteilungen aus d. Papyrussammlung der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 16, Vienna 1986)

Abbreviations

- CEL** = *Corpus Epistularum Latinarum papyris tabulis ostracis servatarum*, collegit, commentario instr. P. Cugusi, I-II (Pap. Flor. 23, Florence 1992)
- CGL** = *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (Leipzig) — II: *Glossae Latinograecae et Graecolatinae*, edd. G. Goetz - G. Gundermann (1888); III: *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, ed. G. Goetz (1892)
- COrdPtol²** = M.-Th. Lenger, *Corpus des Ordonnances des Ptolémées*, réimpr. de l'éd. pr. (1964) corrigée et mise à jour (Brussels 1980)
- CPF** = *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini. Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina* (Florence) — I: *Autori noti*, vols. 1* (1989), 1** (1992)
- CPL** = R. Cavenaile, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden 1958)
- Debut** = Janine Debut, 'Les documents scolaires', *ZPE* 63 (1986) 251-278
- DELG** = P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots* (Paris 1968)
- DGE** = *Diccionario griego-español*, redact. bajo la direcc. de F.R. Adrados (Madrid 1981 ff., in progress)
- Demetrakos** = Δ. Δημητράκου, *Μέγα Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης*, I-IX (Athens 1933 ff.)
- Du Cange** = C. Du Fresne Du Cange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis*, I-II (Lyon 1688)
- FIRA** = *Fontes Iuris Romani Antejustiniani*, ed. altera (Florence) — I: *Leges*, iter. ed. S. Riccobono (1968); II: *Auctores*, ed. notisque ill. J. Baviera; *Liber Syrus-Romanus*, interpr. a C. Ferrini confectam castig. iter. ed. . . . J. Furlani (1968); III: *Negotia*, ed. V. Arangio-Ruiz, ed. alt. append. aucta (1972)
- GB** = *Glossaria Bilinguia in papyris et membranis reperta*, hrsg. u. komm. von J. Kramer (PTA 30, Bonn 1983)
- GBEBP** = G. Cavallo - H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period A.D. 300-800* (BICS Suppl. 47, London 1987)
- GCS** = Die griechische christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten ^{drei} Jahrhunderte (Berlin)
- GDI I** = *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, I, hrsg. von H. Collitz (Göttingen 1884)
- GDRK** = *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, gesamm. u. hrsg. v. Ernst Heitsch — I²: Band I, 2., veränd. Aufl. (Abh. d. Ak. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., Dritte Folge nr. 49, Göttingen 1963); II: Band II (Abh. d. Ak. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., Dritte Folge nr. 58, Göttingen 1964)
- Gignac** = F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* — I: *Phonology* (Testi e Doc. per lo Stud. dell' Ant. 55, Milan [1976]); II: *Morphology* (Testi e Doc. per lo Stud. dell' Ant. 55, Milan 1981)

Abbreviations

- Gildersleeve = B.L. Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes* (New York - Cincinnati - Chicago) — I (1900); II (1911)
- GLH = *Greek Literary Hands 350 B.C. - A.D. 400*, by C.H. Roberts (Oxford 1956)
- GMAW² = *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, by E.G. Turner, 2nd ed. revised and enlarged by P.J. Parsons (BICS Suppl. 46, London 1987)
- GP² = J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. revised by K.J. Dover (Oxford 1950, repr. London-Indianapolis 1996)
- GPGRE = *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt. Contributions to the Study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity*, by Alfons Wouters (Verhandel. van de Koninkl. Acad. voor Wetenschapp., Lett. en Schone Kunst. van België - Kl. der Lett., Jaarg. 41 nr. 92, Brussels 1979)
- Kriaras = E. Κριαρῶ, *Λεξικὸν τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δημώδους γραμματείας 1100-1669* (Salonica 1968 ff., in progress)
- Kühner-Blass = *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, von R. Kühner, I — *Elementar- und Formenlehre*, 3. Aufl. besorgt von Fr. Blass, I-II (Hannover 1890-1892)
- Kühner-Gerth = *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, von R. Kühner, II — *Satzlehre*, 3. Aufl. besorgt von B. Gerth, I-II (Hannover-Leipzig 1898-1904)
- Lampe = *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. by G.W.H. Lampe (Oxford 1961)
- LfgrE = *Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos*, begr. von B. Snell (Göttingen 1955 ff., in progress)
- LRG = *Lessico dei romanzieri greci* — I: A-Γ, [by] F. Conca - E. De Carli - G. Zanetto (Milan 1983); II: Δ-Ι, [by] F. Conca - E. De Carli - G. Zanetto (Alpha-Omega A 78, Hildesheim-Zurich-New York 1989); III: Κ-Ο, [by] S. Beta - E. De Carli - G. Zanetto (Alpha-Omega A 78, Hildesheim-Zurich-New York 1993); IV: Π-Ω, [by] S. Beta - E. De Carli - G. Zanetto (Alpha-Omega A 78, Hildesheim-Zurich-New York 1997)
- LSJ = *A Greek-English Lexicon*, comp. by H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, rev. and augm. throughout by Sir H.S. Jones *et al.*, 9th ed. (Oxford 1940)
- LSJ Rev. Suppl. = H.G. Liddell - R. Scott - H. Stuart Jones - R. McKenzie, *Greek-English Lexicon. Revised Supplement*, ed. by P.G.W. Glare with the assistance of A.A. Thompson (Oxford 1996)
- LSJ Suppl. = H.G. Liddell-R. Scott-H.S. Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon. A Supplement*, ed. by E.A. Barber with the assistance of P. Maas *et al.* (Oxford 1968)

Abbreviations

- Mayser = E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften* (Berlin-Leipzig) — I: *Laut- und Wortlehre* (1906; repr. 1923); I 2: *Laut- und Wortlehre. Flexionslehre*, 2., umgearb. Aufl. (1938); I 3: *Laut- und Wortlehre. Stammbildung*, 2., umgearb. Aufl. (1936); II 1-2: *Satzlehre. Analytischer Teil* (1926-1934); II 3: *Satzlehre. Synthetischer Teil* (1934)
- Mayser - Schmoll = E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*, I 1: *Laut- und Wortlehre. Einleitung und Lautlehre*, 2. Aufl. bearb. von H. Schmoll (Berlin 1970)
- M.Chr. = L. Mitteis - U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, II 2: *Juristischer Teil. Chrestomathie*, von L. Mitteis (Leipzig-Berlin 1912)
- Meisterhans - Schwyzer = K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, 3., verm. u. verb. Aufl. besorgt von E. Schwyzer (Berlin 1900)
- Moulton = J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, I: *Prolegomena*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh 1908)
- Moulton - Howard = J.H. Moulton - W.F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, II: *Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament* (Edinburgh 1929)
- New Docs. = *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, I-VI, by G.H.R. Horsley et al. (North Ryde [Australia] 1981-1992)
- N. Pap. Prim. = P.W. Pestman, *The New Papyrological Primer*, being the 5th ed. of David and van Groningen's *Papyrological Primer* (Leiden 1990)
- Pack² = R.A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, 2nd ed. (Ann Arbor 1967)
- Pap. Agon. = P. Frisch, *Zehn agonistische Papyri* (Pap. Colon. 13, Opladen)
- PCG = *Poetae Comici Graeci*, edd. R. Kassel - C. Austin (Berlin-New York 1983 ff., in progress)
- PIR² = *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* — I - III: edd. E. Groag - A. Stein (Berlin - Leipzig 1933-1943); IV 1: L. Petersen (Berlin 1970)
- PLRE = *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge) — I: by A.H.M. Jones - J.R. Martindale - J. Morris (1971); II: AD 395-527, by J.R. Martindale (1980); III A-B: AD 527-641, by J.R. Martindale (1992)
- PMG = *Poetae Melici Graeci*, ed. D.L. Page (Oxford 1962)
- PTA = *Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen* (Bonn 1968 ff., in progress)

Abbreviations

- Schmid = W.Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus* I-V (Stuttgart 1887 - 1897; repr. Hildesheim 1964)
- SChr = Sources Chrétiennes (Paris)
- Schwyzler = E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik* I-III, 5., unveränd. Aufl. (Munich 1977)
- Sel. Pap. = *Select Papyri* (Loeb Class. Libr., Cambridge [Mass.] - London) — I: *Non-Literary Papyri: Private Affairs*, by A.S. Hunt - C.C. Edgar (1932, latest repr. 1988); II: *Non-Literary Papyri: Public Documents*, by A.S. Hunt - C.C. Edgar (1934, latest repr. 1977); III: *Literary Papyri: Poetry*, by D.L. Page (1941, latest repr. 1970)
- SGLG = Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (Berlin - New York)
- SH = *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, edd. H. Lloyd-Jones - P.Parsons (Berlin - New York 1983)
- Sophocles = E.A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)* (New York - Leipzig 1890)
- SPhGL = *Scriptores Physiognomonici Graeci et Latini*, rec. R. Foerster, I-II (BT, Leipzig 1893)
- TGL = *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* ab H. Stephano constructus, . . . tertio edd. C. B. Hase et al., I-VIII (Paris 1831-1865)
- Threatte = L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* (Berlin - New York) — I: *Phonology* (1980); II: *Morphology* (1996)
- TrGF II = *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, vol. 2, edd. R. Kannicht - B. Snell (Göttingen 1981)
- Turner, Syntax = *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by J.H. Moulton, III: *Syntax*, by N. Turner (Edinburgh 1963)
- Turner, Style = *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by J.H. Moulton, IV: *Style*, by N. Turner (Edinburgh 1976)
- WB = *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten*, von Fr. Preisigke, hrsg. von E. Kiessling (Berlin) — I (1925¹); II (1927); IV 1-4 (α-επικόπτω) (1944-1971)

¹ NB. The initial parts of vol. I had already appeared separately before the full publication of the volume. The first issue ('Lieferung' 1), containing α-δίκη, had been edited by Preisigke at Heidelberg in 1924; after his death, Kiessling took responsibility for two more issues, then for the collective vol. I, which includes (a) Preisigke's 1924 contribution, (b) a slightly revised version of Kiessling's issues, (c) a continuation of all the previously published parts (cf. WB I viii). I have used Kiessling's 1925 complete volume throughout.

Abbreviations

WB Suppl. 1 = *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienschilder usw. aus Ägypten*, hrsg. von E. Kiessling — *Supplement 1 (1940-1966)*, bearb. von W. Rübsam (Amsterdam 1969)

WB Suppl. 2 = *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienschilder usw. aus Ägypten. Supplement 2 (1967-1976)*, hrsg. von H.-A. Rupprecht, bearb. von A. Jördens (Wiesbaden 1991)

W.Chr. = L.Mitteis - U.Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, I 2: *Historischer Teil. Chrestomathie*, von U. Wilcken (Leipzig-Berlin 1912)

(B) GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS

absol. = absolute	imp. = imperative
acc. = accusative	impf. = imperfect
act. = active	ind. = indicative
adj. = adjective(s)	inf. = infinitive
<i>ad loc.</i> = <i>ad locum</i> (on the passage under consideration)	inscr. = inscription
adv. = adverb	intr. = intransitive
Alex. = Alexandria	introd. = introduction
Ant. = Antinoopolis	Kar. = Karanis
aor. = aorist	<i>l.</i> = <i>lege</i> (read)
Aphrod. = Aphrodito	l(l). = line(s)
bibl. = bibliography	Lat. = Latin
Byz. = Byzantine	lett. = letter
cent. = century	lit. = literary
chor = choriamb	masc. = masculine
cit. = cited	Med. = Medieval
class. = classical	MGr = Modern Greek
col(s). = column(s)	MS(S) = manuscript(s)
conj. = conjunction	n(s). = (foot)note(s)
constr(r). = construction(s)	neg. = negative
cr = cretic	neut. = neuter
dat. = dative	no(s). = number(s)
decl. = declension	nom. = nominative
doc(s). = document(s)	NT = <i>New Testament</i>
ed. = edition, edited by	obj. = object
e.g. = <i>exempli gratia</i> (for example)	off. = official
esp. = especially	opt. = optative
ex(x). = example(s)	Oxy. = Oxyrhynchus, Oxyrhynchite nome
fem. = feminine	p(p). = page(s)
fr(r). = fragment(s)	Panop. = Panopolis
fut. = future	pap. = papyrus, papyri
gen. = genitive	part. = partitive
gl(l). = gloss(es)	pass. = passive
Gr. = Greek	perf. = perfect
Hell. = Hellenistic	pers. = person
Heracl. = Heracleopolis Magna	pet. = petition
Herm. = Hermopolis, Hermopolite nome	Philad. = Philadelphia
ia = iambic metron	pl. = plate

Abbreviations

plupf. = pluperfect	Socn. = Socnopaïou Nesos
plur. = plural	sth. = something
prep. = preposition	subj. = subjunctive, subject
pres. = present	subst. = substantive
priv. = private	s.v. = <i>sub voce</i> (under the word)
Ptol. = Ptolemaic	Teht. = Tehtynis
ref(s). = reference(s)	Thead. = Theadelphia
refl. = reflexive	tr = trochaic metron
rel. = relative	trans. = transitive, translation
Rom. = Roman	translit. = transliteration
sb. = somebody	vb(s). = verb(s)
scil. = <i>scilicet</i> (supply)	v(v). l(l). = <i>varia(e) lectio(nes)</i> (variant reading(s))
sic = so (reading transcribed as it stands in the original)	voc. = vocative
sing. = singular	

(C) SYMBOLS

A^{ac} = 'MS A before correction'.

AP^c = 'MS A after first-hand correction'.

AP^{cs1} = 'MS A after first-hand correction added above the line'.

(D) A NOTE ON THE TRANSLITERATION OF ANCIENT NAMES AND ON CROSS-REFERENCES

- (i) Following an accepted practice in papyrology, I have not adopted a rigorous consistency with the transliteration of ancient names.
- (ii) Internal references are by either page (p.) or paragraph (§) numbers according to the circumstances. If the latter system is used, note: (a) references from one chapter to another include an indication of the chapter number (e.g., 'Ch. II § 1.2'); (b) references from one paragraph to another within the same chapter are by paragraph number only (e.g., '§ 1.2').

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. THE AIM OF THE PRESENT THESIS

1.1. The history of modern scholarship on the language of Greek non-literary sources from Egypt began long before the systematic papyrological excavations and publications of the last decades of the nineteenth century. Mention must be made especially of a detailed study which Barthold Georg Niebuhr devoted in 1822 (or rather 1827) to the Greek language of numerous ostraca and inscriptions from Nubia and Upper Egypt which had been found and transcribed for him by the architect François Christian Gau.¹ Niebuhr's contribution represented the first attempt at studying in its own right the Greek of a substantial group of non-literary sources from Graeco-Roman Egypt.² His notion of 'Graeco-Egyptian jargon', which evidently aimed to emphasise the peculiarities of the Greek language in Egypt, seems to have had a remarkable impact on contemporary scholarship and to have contributed to the formation of the modern notion of 'Hellenism'.³ More extensive and more thorough investigations into the language of papyri were undertaken at the end of the last century, after massive

¹ B.G. Niebuhr, 'Inscripfen in Nubien und Ägypten abgezeichnet von F.C. Gau, VIII. Ueber das Aegyptisch-griechische' 24-26, in F.C. Gau, *Neu entdeckte Denkmäler von Nubien, an den Ufern des Nils, von der ersten bis zur zweiten Katarakte* (Stuttgart-Paris 1822) [the volume was reportedly published in separate issues; that containing Niebuhr's contribution seems to have come out in 1827, cf. E. Vischer, *Niebuhr: Briefe. Neue Folge 1816-1830*, I 2 (Bern-Munich 1981) 787 n. 15] = Niebuhr, *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften*, II (Bonn 1843) 197-208; for a concise evaluation of the language of the Nubian documents cf. also his letter of September 1822 to Lord Colchester (Vischer, *Niebuhr* 787-788). On Gau and Niebuhr see K. Preisendanz, *Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung* (Leipzig 1933) 167 and esp. Canfora 1995, 22. On the papyrological finds in the years c. 1815, see Preisendanz, *Papyrusfunde* 74 ff. Surveys of late eighteenth- / early nineteenth-century scholarship on non-literary Koine (especially of Graeco-Roman Egypt): (a) inscriptions: Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 11; Canfora 1995, 15-18; (b) papyri: Canfora 1995, 20-21.

² For an appraisal of Niebuhr's approach in the light of early nineteenth-century scholarship see Canfora 1995, esp. 23-24.

³ Canfora 1995, 19-20 and esp. 21 ff.; cf. Bichler 1991, 367. On the origin and development of 'Hellenism' cf. also R. Bichler, *Hellenismus, Geschichte und Problematik eines Epochenbegriffs* (Darmstadt 1983).

quantities of papyri began to be published annually.¹ Nowadays papyri represent one of the major sources of information on post-classical Greek (or Koine Greek).² Many aspects of their language have attracted the attention of scholars.

Recent surveys: Gignac 1970 & 1985. General grammars: L.R. Palmer, *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri*, I (London 1945); Mayser-Schmoll; Mayser; Gignac I-II. Select grammatical and stylistic studies focusing on, or making much use of, papyri: Horn 1926; Kapsomenakis 1938; Ljungvik 1926, 1932, 1933; Mandilaras 1973; Moulton 1901, 1904; Rydbeck 1967; Salonius 1927; Serz 1920; Völker 1900, 1903; Zilliacus 1943 (esp. 30-51), 1956, 1967; Zucker 1929-30; cf. also § 3.4.4.1.3.1(II)-(III). Vocabulary: *WB* I-II, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich (in part). Countless studies and observations will be found in monographs and articles. List of desiderata: Horsley 1994.

The language of papyri is generally viewed as vulgar Greek. While it is no doubt true that papyrus documents can as a rule be ranked within the lower levels of style of post-classical Greek, it is also apparent that they are not homogeneous in register, that is, in their degree of stylistic and linguistic (morphological, syntactical, lexical) refinement. Some scholars have drawn attention to this state of affairs with pointed, yet brief, observations,³ but in general there is a lack of awareness among philologists, classicists, and linguists about differences in register to be found in the papyri; only a simplistic distinction between private and official documents is occasionally allowed for at a theoretical level. A thorough investigation of registers in papyri remains a desideratum. A pressing desideratum, one should emphasise, because this would contribute significantly to our knowledge both of the language of papyri and of Koine Greek in general.

In fact, not only are there considerable variations in the use of style and language among unsophisticated documents, but many papyri also display

¹ Cf. A. Thumb, *APF* 2 (1903) 396-401 (survey of publications 1896-1901); J. Kramer 1994 (on 1891-1906). Late nineteenth-century publications on the language of Koine inscriptions are mentioned by Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 11.

² On the notion of 'post-classical Greek' cf. Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 9. On the term 'Koine' cf. § 4.1 below. Major introductions to Koine Greek include: Thumb 1901; Radermacher 1947; Kapsomenos 1958; Schwyzer I 116-134; Meillet 1965, 241-318; Debrunner-Scherer 1969; Browning 1983, 19-52; R. Browning, 'Von der Koine bis zu den Anfängen des modernen Griechisch', in H.-G. Nesselrath (ed.), *Einleitung in die gr. Philologie* (Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997) 156-168; cf. also Schwyzer 1901; Thumb 1906; Wifstrand 1952. For further refs. cf. Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 4. Recent introductions to Medieval Greek: Browning 1983, 53 ff.; Egea 1987; Tonnet 1993; cf. also Browning 1978. Bibliographic surveys of scholarship up to 1935: A. Thumb, *APF* 2 (1903) 396-427 (1896-1901); St. Witkowski, *JAW* 120 (1904) 153-256 (1899-1902); 159 (1912) 1-279 (1903-1906); A. Debrunner, *JAW* 236 (1932) 115-226 & 240 (1933) 1-25 (1907-1929); 261 (1938) 140-208 (1930-1935).

³ Cf. Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 13; J.A.L. Lee, *NT* 27 (1985) 9; Horsley 1989, 45; Horsley 1994, 64.

varying degrees of literary pretension. Taking the whole of papyrus evidence into consideration, it is possible to observe a sufficiently wide range of possible variations in the degree of stylistic and linguistic refinement to embrace at one extreme very elaborate and polished texts and at the other exceedingly informal and vulgar sources. Indeed, the impact of certain characteristics of post-classical literary Greek on papyri has been dealt with in a small number of contributions. Atticism, for instance, has recently been discussed by Carlos Hernandez Lara, whereas poeticisms were studied by Henrik Zilliacus three decades ago.¹ But in spite of their merits these works (especially that of Hernandez Lara) suffer from serious methodological weaknesses which impair their results. In particular, they incorrectly treat occurrences of the language varieties under discussion separately from their linguistic and stylistic context.²

1.2. This thesis discusses for the first time the reception of higher level Greek in select categories of papyri from second- to sixth-century Egypt (cf. § 2). It thus contributes to research on the more general question of levels of style in Koine.

My attention will first focus on two fundamental high-level language varieties. Atticisms will be investigated with a view to assessing the impact of purism on written usage outside the realm of literature, or more precisely the attitudes of individuals to the recognised linguistic norms of good usage in their everyday written performances, both public and private (Ch. III § 1). The phenomenon of severe puristic intervention will be explored through an analysis of two test cases, and the interaction between attitudes to extreme puristic variants and the weighting of non-puristic elements will be discussed. Loans from poetic language will also receive due consideration because of their widespread diffusion in literature, although they were proscribed by the most severe promoters of Atticist purism (Ch. III § 2).

I shall then examine the global strategies of stylistic refinement from a selection of private letters (Ch. IV). This will allow me (a) to define the impact of other higher-level language varieties; (b) to investigate the attitudes of individuals not only to literary language but also to elaborate style; (c) to set Atticisms and poeticisms in the context of the general stylistic profile of the texts in which they occur; (d) to examine the relationship between linguistic competence, written performance, and Greek theories of the epistolary style.³ This objective will require the preliminary discussion of some

¹ Atticism: Hernandez Lara 1994, 142-219; cf. also the brief remarks by Horsley 1989, 47-48 and Horsley 1994, 64-65. Poeticisms: Zilliacus 1967, 71 ff.

² For more details cf. Ch. III §§ 1 and 2, respectively.

³ Correlation between education, rhetoric, and actual stylistic practice as a potential topic for the study of levels of style: Ševčenko 1981a, 306 (focusing on Byzantine literature).

Chapter One

background topics. I shall focus on grammatical education in second- to sixth-century Egypt with a view to determining the kind of linguistic schooling which educated individuals were presumably offered during their years of study (Ch. II § 1); and I shall outline the stylistic precepts of known epistolary theorists in order to place the stylistic strategies of the same individuals within their rhetorical background (Ch. II §§ 2-3).

Throughout this thesis, I shall correlate the stylistic and linguistic performance with the function of the message which the writers wanted to convey, as well as with the recipients to whom the message was directed.¹

¹ For the use of the modern notion of functional styles in studying levels of style in a neighbouring discipline cf. Ševčenko 1981a, 307-309 (on Byzantine literature).

2. THE PRIMARY EVIDENCE

2.1. This thesis is based on a personal examination of a fairly extensive body of primary evidence made up of literary and non-literary prose texts preserved on papyrus, school-texts from Roman and Byzantine Egypt,¹ and select genres of literary prose works transmitted by Medieval manuscripts. The vast majority of these sources are published. I have carefully checked photographs (whether published or privately obtained) and/or the originals of a large number of papyri and tablets, including *almost all* the most important items discussed in this thesis. I have done so in compliance with the requirements of the methodological principles outlined in §§ 3.2 and 3.3, and in view of the fact that not only readings and supplements printed (especially) in the first editions but also corrections proposed subsequently (including those listed in *BL* I-IX) may not be correct. I have also inspected the originals of some fifteen Medieval manuscripts containing Byzantine manuals of letter-writing. Furthermore, I have examined some unpublished material preserved on papyrus, and have referred to it whenever it has seemed to contribute new information on the issues under discussion. It is regrettable that it has proved impossible to offer full editions or even detailed descriptions of the unpublished works cited.

2.2. I shall now focus on the papyri, the language and style of which will be discussed in the course of this thesis, and on the criteria for selection.² I have examined in detail several hundreds of non-literary papyri which have been selected from among thousands of items on account of their type (§ 2.2.1) and date (§ 2.2.2).

2.2.1. *Type*. The kind of linguistic research with which I concern myself requires that the selection of the relevant sources obeys two preliminary conditions: (a) it must single out texts which writers were free to phrase as they liked; (b) in order for the comparative method outlined in § 3.4 to be made possible, the selection must include pieces of work produced at different levels of the social scale as well as belonging to

¹ A note on periodisation and terminology. In this thesis, the term 'Byzantine' is used for historical and cultural *realia* after AD 312. My choice makes no claim to historical acceptability either with regard to Egypt (for which see most recently A. Giardina, 'Egitto bizantino o tardo antico ? Problemi della terminologia e della periodizzazione', in Criscuolo-Geraci 1989, 96-103; R. Bagnall 1993, ix) or the East in general. Rather, it aims at mere clarity by creating an overlap between my chosen linguistic meaning of 'Byzantine Greek' (§ 4.1) and one of the traditional periodisations in scholarship concerning Egypt and the Byzantine empire. Nevertheless, 'late antique' is sometimes used in place of 'Byzantine' to emphasise the intrinsic coherence of the early fourth- to mid fifth-century period. The term 'late Roman' refers to c. AD 260-312.

² For the primary sources used for linguistic comparison see § 3.4.4.1.3.

Chapter One

both the official and private spheres. In compliance with these principles, I have taken into account all categories of non-literary papyri which are for the most part free of formulae¹ and were produced in realms ranging from the imperial chancery to the common people. The evidence discussed in this thesis will inevitably be only a selection of the material examined. In Chapter Four, I shall concentrate on select examples of private correspondence, whereas the subject-matter of Chapter Three will require that I focus my attention on additional sources, including forensic speeches, declamations, imperial constitutions, prefectural decrees, judicial proceedings, official correspondence, petitions, and even contracts.

Further selections within these genres will be made according to circumstances. Thus, when discussing purism in imperial rescripts, I shall consider letters, but not subscripts. We do have evidence on the ancient norms which regulated the use of purism in imperial correspondence, but we have no such information on subscripts. Moreover, unlike the former, the latter present problems which may seriously affect analysis. Since Ulrich Wilcken's study of imperial rescripts, it has generally been agreed that although both letters and subscripts were written in response to petitions directed to the emperors, the former were issued by the bureau of *ab epistulis*, whereas the latter were dispatched by the department of *a libellis*.² Letters were addressed to the petitioners in the language used in the petitions. Petitions written in Greek prompted a reply in Greek. Thus, with the exclusion of particular cases, Greek imperial letters do not represent translations from Latin.³ On the other hand, whether Greek subscripts were composed originally in Greek or Latin is disputed.

Cf. F. Martín 1982, 324-325; Honoré 1994, 51-52 (with refs. at p. 51 n. 104). There is explicit proof of translation from Latin,⁴ but this practice may have varied in the course of time (Oliver 1989, 321) and in relation not only to the status of the recipient but also to the place of issue (Williams 1974, 103; Honoré 1994, 52). I

¹ Even letters and petitions are not entirely free of formulae and idiomatic phrases, but their use was never so overwhelmingly pervasive and binding as to limit the writers' freedom of composition. Moreover, the choice of certain epistolary formulae in preference to alternative variants involved stylistic judgements (Ch. III § 2.1.2; Ch. IV § 1.3.1). In some cases, writers even remodelled the style of common formulae (Ch. III § 2.3.1; Ch. IV § 1.2.1 A).

² Cf. Wilcken 1920, 10.

³ Particular needs could require the translation of Latin originals. For instance, the Greek version of a letter of Hadrian as preserved by BGU I 140 (= *M.Chr.* 373 = *Sel. Pap.* II 213 = *FIRA* I 78 = Oliver 1989 no. 70) was translated from Latin (ll. 1-2) probably because a copy of the letter had to be posted up at Alexandria (?) at military headquarters (l. 28 ff.): cf. F. Martín 1982, 327. The translation was presumably supplied by the prefect's staff, see Williams 1974, 102 n. 115; Williams 1975, 52 n. 38; cf. F. Martín 1982, 327.

⁴ P. Harr. I 67, col. ii 11 = Oliver 1989 no. 154 (c. AD 150 ?), cf. U. Wilcken, *APF* 12 (1937) 235.

doubt that a thorough and methodologically correct study of the language ¹ can produce reliable solution of the question.²

In theory, translations may have been supplied by either (a) the *a libellis* or (b) the prefect's staff: (b) seems probable, but (a) is also possible.³ I believe that the puristic (or non-puristic) practice of the imperial chancery should be investigated separately from that of the prefect's bureau, but when dealing with subscripts it is impossible to distinguish items composed in the *a libellis* (if any) from items translated by the prefect's staff (if any).

Indeed, the compositional procedures of other sources pose problems which bear on the evaluation of linguistic evidence, but they are best discussed in the course of the thesis.

2.2.2. *Date*. I have examined sources dating from the early second to late sixth centuries; first-century AD papyri have received less attention and will be discussed only in so far as they provide information relevant to the particular topic under examination. The choice of such a broad span of time has proved necessary in view of two concomitant circumstances. First, owing partly to a desire to bridge the gaps existing in current research, partly to the belief that linguistic phenomena can be adequately assessed only if they are not examined within narrow chronological limits (§ 3.4.4.1.3 (2)-(3)), I have felt the need for a clear perception of the style and language of papyri in a diachronical perspective so as to discern not only the peculiarities of each period but also the elements of continuity. Secondly, in the hope of overcoming the obstacles raised by the unavailability of coherent and homogeneous evidence for each

¹ The brief remarks of F. Pringsheim, *Eos* 48.1 (1956) 239-340 on the vocabulary of SB VI 9526 = P. Col. VI 123 do not suffice to prove his case. For other exx. of allegedly Latinate Greek cf. Williams 1974, 102; N. Lewis, in *Symbolae R. Taubenschlag dedicatae* I 219 (= Lewis 1995, 55); Id., *APF* 33 (1987) 52-53 (= Lewis 1995, 222-223).

² If a rigorous methodology is applied to non-technical vocabulary and syntax, presumably in very few cases it will prove possible to determine whether the Greek is a Latinate or acceptable one. Where this can be established, the results are hard to interpret. A Latinate Greek points to a translation from Latin, but may equally represent a Greek composition by a Latin-speaking individual (cf. Williams 1975, 53; F. Martín 1982, 335). On the other hand, an acceptable Greek may be explained as an original composition (whether by a Greek or by a Latin-speaking individual who had a perfect command of Greek) or as a translation respectful to Greek grammar. Cf. also F. Martín 1982, 335-336.

³ BGU I 140 (see above) favours (b) (Williams 1974, 102 n. 115; cf. 103), but the argument suggested against (a) ('the *a libellis* had presumably no translators attached to it', *ibid.*) is based on weak evidence. True, the *a libellis* was probably never divided into two departments as was done with the *ab epistulis*. But it does not follow that the bureau had no clerks capable of writing in Greek. It may be noted that Greeks are known to have held the post, cf. Parsons 1976, 415 with n. 27. Even the *ab epistulis* remained unified at certain periods. If we hold to Wilcken's reconstruction of the procedure used to reply to petitions (and make no exception), we must

single period, an attempt has been made to use evidence from different periods to illustrate those phenomena which are unlikely either to have been functions of time or to have been exposed to significant changes in the course of centuries.

The chronological boundaries of this thesis reflect no historical periodisation, but have been defined primarily with a view to encompassing the full manifestation of phenomena which influenced the criteria of language selection in high level prose, and which, given the 'non-stagnation' of registers,¹ affected lower stylistic levels as well. It is in the second century that the Atticist movement most vigorously promoted the linguistic thesaurus of Attic authors as the ideal model of correct Greek,² thereby laying the foundations of the canonisation of classical Attic as the puristic language variety *par excellence* in subsequent centuries.³ Similarly, the diffusion of an increasingly redundant, magniloquent, ceremonious style over Late Antiquity and the Byzantine period greatly enlarged the lexical spectrum of high-level non-literary prose.⁴

The lower time-boundary will also allow this study to benefit not only from important sets of homogeneous papyri illustrative of the usage of single individuals who were

assume that even while being unified the *ab epistulis* continued employing Greek-speaking (under)secretaries.

- ¹ Cf. e.g. Brixhe - Hodot 1993, 9, whose terminology ('non-étanchéité') I have adopted here.
- ² For example, Phrynichus expected his *Ἐκλογή Ἀττικῶν ῥημάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων* to be used by ὅστις ἀρχαίως καὶ δοκίμως ἐθέλει διαλέγεσθαι (Phryn. *Ecl.*, *ep. ad Cornel.* p. 60.17 Fisch.). On Atticism in general see now Dihle 1992 and Swain 1996, 17-64. Further discussions include Dihle 1957; Reardon 1971, 80-95; Dihle 1977; Gelzer 1979; Calboli 1986, 1050 ff.; Tonnet 1988, I 301-313 (ns. at II 203-210); Anderson 1993, 86-94. For a comprehensive linguistic study of Atticism of Greek writers of the second sophistic period see Schmid I-IV.
- ³ Atticism of third- and fourth-century writers has not been studied as thoroughly as that of their second-century predecessors. On Atticism in the Byzantine period cf. e.g. Böhlig 1956, (esp.) 1-17, Wirth 1976, and also Hedberg 1935 (on the notion of 'Attic' in Eustathius).
- ⁴ On magniloquence and redundancy in papyri see Zilliacus 1967; cf. also Schubart 1918, 205-211; Zucker 1929-30; Zilliacus 1956; Wolff 1961. Many of Karlsson's remarks on ceremonial in tenth-century epistolary style (Karlsson 1959) are also applicable to fifth- and sixth-century letters.

Chapter One

particularly inclined to adopt an ambitious style in everyday prose,¹ but also from late antique rhetorical materials which provide a firm basis for the assessment of performance.

In spite of the broad span of time examined, an effort will be made to discuss synchronically homogeneous data whenever possible. In particular, in compliance with the comparative principles of linguistic analysis (§ 3.4.4.1.3) I shall concentrate mainly on those centuries which afford the possibility of drawing a close comparison between literary and non-literary texts belonging to the same genre, and also between rhetorical theory and actual performance.

¹ On the importance of homogeneous archives of papyri in the study of language see § 3.1 below.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.0. Undertaking the previously unattempted task to study in a systematic manner the uses of higher level Greek in an extensive and chronologically broadly-spanning corpus of non-literary papyri has required a preliminary confrontation with (a) the tenets of modern linguistic stylistics, (b) the results of similar investigations in neighbouring disciplines, (c) suggestions on specific aspects of my chosen topic as found in several studies of the post-classical Greek language and culture.¹ In general, in order to provide a firm basis for this study I have rigorously refrained from deriving any beliefs from theoretical principles. All speculations have without exception been tested against firm evidence, and credit has been given to tenets for which convincing proof has been found; as a rule, judgements of possibility, probability and the like, although unavoidable in such matters, have not been taken as bases for further progress. As a result, I have considered the on-going debate in modern linguistics and stylistics on select topics of primary importance such as the relationship between style and language, the concept of diglossia, and the notion of purism; but I have not ventured to apply to ancient texts results of studies based exclusively on modern languages. Furthermore, I have not disregarded *a priori*, yet have never followed without verification, scholarly statements and even widely accepted views on Roman and early Byzantine Koine Greek which are based either on purely theoretical speculation, or largely insufficient evidence, or an unsatisfactory methodology.

On the other hand, I have borrowed much - in terms of principles, methods, and perspectives - from the thorough research into stylistic registers in Byzantine prose which was carried out in particular in the late 1970s and early 1980s.² I have thought it advisable to do so, first, because it is also concerned with texts and authors that are chronologically close to my chosen period of time; secondly, because in spite of the undeniable changes there is clearly a continuum linking the late antique and early Byzantine perception of style and stylistic registers with that of later periods. I have also gained greatly from certain excellent studies on classical Greek.³

In order to derive firm evidence from the sources, I have assessed linguistic

¹ A similar procedure was followed by Ihor Ševčenko in his discussion of Byzantine levels of style: cf. Ševčenko 1981b, 224 ff.

² See esp. Hunger 1978a; Ševčenko 1981a & 1981b; Hunger 1981, 19-24. Herbert Hunger's masterly description of Byzantine *Umgangssprache* (Hunger 1981) is of primary importance. Cf. also Browning 1978.

³ One of these is Sir Kenneth Dover's latest book (Dover 1997).

and stylistic phenomena individually and have considered those external data which may provide relevant information. §§ 3.1-3.4 below will describe this methodology in detail.

3.1. SETTING PAPYRI IN CONTEXT

3.1.1. It has been correctly pointed out that papyri form such a heterogeneous corpus that they cannot be studied *tout ensemble*.¹ It is essential to draw distinctions even within a corpus, such as mine, which has been preliminarily defined by employing chronological and typological criteria, and to work on groups of homogeneous papers selected on the basis of a common denominator.

3.1.2. Given the purposes of this thesis, it is in procedural terms most important to focus primarily on individual writers, since style is fundamentally the outcome of personal elaboration.² But other aggregating elements can also be defined. Possible candidates are all those factors which may have exerted a direct or indirect influence on performance.³

3.1.3. The task of using individuals as centres of interest and main aggregating factors is often hard to accomplish. Although papyri are very abundant in absolute figures, we are rarely fortunate enough to recover from the sand groups of papers written by one and the same individual, or to assemble them once the papyri have been unearthed during different excavations and possibly from different spots. Unfortunately, of the (presumably) large number of papyri which each educated individual wrote during his life-time, whether with his own hand or by using the services of other people (§ 3.2.2.1 (ii)), and whether for his own cause or on behalf of other people, only one item, be it a letter or a petition, has generally survived the vicissitudes of history. From this, important consequences follow, both as to data collection and with regard to the evaluation of evidence. First, it may generate serious difficulties in determining the authorship of sources, which bears in many respects upon the assessment of the language.⁴ Second, it prevents us from carrying out

¹ Zilliacus 1943, 6.

² Cf. Frösén 1974, 137; Wahlgren 1995, 14 ('Stil hat mit individueller Absicht zu tun').

³ Cf. Zilliacus 1943, 6-7, who emphasised the importance of the date and provenance of the papyri, as well as of the level of education of the writers. These and other factors will be discussed in detail in the course of the thesis.

⁴ For instance, it is impossible to tell whether an isolated letter, which is written in its entirety by one and the same hand, is an autograph composition of the sender or not; and if not, whether that is explained by illiteracy or contingent motives (§ 3.2.2.1(i)). It is also impossible to tell whether a petition, which is penned by a scribe, was composed by the subscriber or by the scribe himself.

Chapter One

methodologically correct linguistic analyses (§ 3.4.3). Thirdly, it precludes the obtaining of essential information on the education, cultural interests (if any), and social background of the individual whose language use is being examined.

I have tried, therefore, to make much use of (i) sets of papers which can be shown on the grounds of internal and/or external criteria to have been composed by the same individual;¹ (ii) books as evidence of literary interests, whenever their ownership and readership can be determined objectively;² (iii) *dossiers* and archives of documents which provide information on the social background of the individuals involved in the text under consideration.³ On the other hand, I shall refrain from building upon assertions whose veracity cannot be verified without sufficient evidence.

For instance, it would not have been possible to determine that P.Sakaon 44 was composed by the subscriber, if its duplicate P.Turner 44 had not been available for textual comparison (§ 3.2.1.1(a); cf. also § 3.2.2.1 (ii)). For the bearing of these uncertainties upon language see § 3.2.2.2.

- ¹ An external criterion is palaeography, cf. § 3.3.1. An internal criterion is the occurrence of like phrases and expressions in different papers: for instance, that Cl. Terentianus composed his own non-autograph letters (App. (B) § 1.2) is supported by two sets of strong verbal analogies, cf. (a) P.Mich. VIII 476.3-5; 477.2-5; 478.3-6; 479.3-4; 480.3-5; (b) P.Mich. VIII 476.17; 479.16.
- ² For a general discussion of the problem cf. Clarysse 1983.
- ³ Useful, yet incomplete and out-of-date, lists of such 'archives' will be found in Montevicchi 1988, 248-261 and 575-578. On the nature of these sets of papers and the legitimacy of applying the notions of 'archive' and 'dossier' to them see A. Martin, 'Archives privées et cachettes documentaires', in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proc. of the 20th Int. Congr. of Pap.* (Copenhagen 1994) 569-577. In fact, serious obstacles often prevent us from applying Martin's criteria to extant sources (cf. the observations of R. Mazza [1997, 12 ff.] on the Apion's archive). In this thesis, my usage of the word 'archive' will be looser and papyrologically more traditional than that of Martin. For a similar choice cf. R.S. Bagnall, *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History* (London-New York 1995) 123 n. 13; Mazza 1997,

3.2. COPY, ORIGINAL, AUTOGRAPH

Original or Copy?

3.2.1. Everyone is aware that 'in almost all cases' ancient Greek literary writings 'have survived, if they have survived at all, only in copies many stages removed from the originals, copies of which not a single one is free from error'.¹ Consequently, everyone who wants to carry out serious linguistic research into those writings is well aware of the necessity of taking the uncertainties of the transmission into due consideration. On the other hand, it is too often claimed, unfortunately even by scholars working on non-literary Greek, that non-literary sources are originals and are therefore not exposed to errors and perturbations.² But one must remember:

- (i) that imperial decrees and letters have survived only in copies. This is true not only of the constitutions transmitted by the later legal sources and collections such as the *Digest*, but also of inscriptions and papyri;
- (ii) that all the extant decrees of the prefects of Egypt are copies;
- (iii) that judicial proceedings may not reproduce the *ipsissima verba* of the parties and the presiding officials (cf. Ch. III § 1.3.1.3.1);
- (iv) that a fair number of official letters are copies;
- (v) that many of the papyrus petitions are copies;
- (vi) that documents, too, are often copies.

An examination of sources that have survived in more than one copy reveals a great number and variety of textual divergences between manuscripts. It will suffice to collate the extant copies of the following documents:³

Imperial Constitutions

(1) Edict of Hadrian on a tax moratorium in Egypt (AD 136), extant in four copies.⁴ For

8, 16-17.

¹ M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart 1973) 7-8.

² Two recent examples: (i) Brixhe-Hodot 1993, 11: 'les inscriptions et les papyri constituent naturellement une source essentielle de documentation, en raison . . . du *caractère direct de leur transmission*, qui permet de disposer de *témoins sûrs des usages effectifs*' (my own italics); (ii) Wahlgren 1995, 20: 'ferner habe ich inschriftliches Material sowie Papyri verwendet - Material, *das keinen nachträglichen Änderungen ausgesetzt worden ist*' (my own italics).

³ For further examples see Ch. III § 1.2.1.2.1.

⁴ A = P. Cair. inv. JE 49359 (*P. Oslo* III p. 57 = F. Martín 1982 no. 51 A = Oliver 1989 no. 88 A); B = P. Cair. inv. JE 49360 (*P. Oslo* III p. 58 = F. Martín 1982 no. 51 B = Oliver 1989 no. 88 B); C =

Chapter One

a list of their discrepancies see Papathomas, *P.Heid.* VII (1996) pp. 84-85.

- (2) Edict of Hadrian of uncertain date, extant in three copies.¹

Regulations Issued by Other Authorities

- (3) Gnomon of the Idios Logos, ed. J. Méléze Modrzejewski, in *Le lois de Romains* (Camerino 1977) 520-557: the divergences between the two surviving copies, P.Oxy. XLII 3014 and BGU V 1210, are discussed by P. Parsons in his edition of P.Oxy. 3014.

Petitions

- (4) Petition of AD 331-332 from Theadelphia, extant in two copies, viz. P.Turner 44 (= B) and P. Sakaon 44² (= A). A full list of their many textual discrepancies is given in P.Turner 44's *ed. pr.*; the most important ones will be discussed in § 3.2.1.1 below.

Contracts

- (5) Contract from Tebtynis, extant in two copies, viz. PSI VIII 905 (= A) and P.Mich. V 252 (= B). Incomplete lists of their extensive textual divergences are found in PSI VIII (1927) p. xviii and esp. *P.Mich.* V (1944) pp. 133-134.
- (6) Grant of a plot of land from Kellis of AD 333, extant in two copies, P.Kell. G. I 38 a and b: for their slight divergences see Worp 1995, 112.

3.2.1.1. Certain of the discrepancies between the surviving copies of these sources depend on psychological or mechanical errors. Some others involve variations of content. But quite a few are divergences of linguistic character and relate to:

(i) morphology, cf. § 3.2.1 no. 5: $\delta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ (A 6) / $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\omicron$ (B 4) (gen.);

(ii) syntax, cf. § 3.2.1 no. 1: rel. pronoun (B 18) / article as rel. pronoun (A 17) (C,D missing);

§ 3.2.1 no. 2: rel. clause with vb. in the ind. (and subj. in the nom. (?)) (B 3 and 4 ff.) / gen. absolute (A 5 and 5 ff.) (C missing);

§ 3.2.1 no. 5: dual (A 6) / plur. (B 4);

§ 3.2.1 no. 5: aor. inf. (A 15) / fut. inf. (B 8);

§ 3.2.1 no. 5: sing. (A 16) / plur. (B 9) in a comparative of adv.;

(iii) vocabulary, cf. § 3.2.1 no. 1: $\omicron\upsilon \pi\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ (B 6) / $\omicron\upsilon\pi\omega$ (A 7) (C,D missing);

§ 3.2.1 no. 1: $\acute{\alpha}\nu[\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\nu]$ (or $\acute{\alpha}\nu[\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\kappa\eta]$) (A 9-10)³ / $[\chi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\varsigma]$ (B 9) (C,D missing);

(iv) word order, cf. § 3.2.1 no. 2: $\delta\omicron[\theta]\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega\acute{\nu} \delta\omega\rho\epsilon\omega\acute{\nu} \tau\eta \sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{o}\delta\omega$ (B 3) / $\delta\omicron\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega\acute{\nu} \tau\eta$

P. Oslo III 78 (= F. Martín 1982 no. 51 C = Oliver 1989 no. 88 C); D = P.Heid. VII 396.

¹ A = P. Oxy. XXVII 2476.4-7 (= F. Martín 1982 no. 34 B = Oliver 1989 no. 96 A = *Pap. Agon.* 3.4-7); B = BGU IV 1074.3-5 (= SB I 5225) (= F. Martín 1982 no. 34 A = Oliver 1989 no. 96 B = *Pap. Agon.* 1.3-7 [repr. as SB XVI 13034]); C = P. Oxy. Hels. 25.1-2 (= Oliver 1989 no. 96 C = *Pap. Agon.* 4.1-2).

² = P.Thead. 17 = *Sel. Pap.* II 295.

³ $\acute{\alpha}\nu[\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\kappa\eta]$ has recently been suggested by Papathomas, but I think that $\acute{\alpha}\nu[\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\nu]$ is a possible alternative.

Chapter One

συνόδῳ δωρεῶν (C) (A missing).

It follows that single papyrus copies of non-literary texts subject to a process of multi-stage copying may not preserve faithful record of their original linguistic form. I have accordingly taken the uncertainties of the textual transmission into due consideration at all stages of my research. Whenever (and as far as) possible, an attempt has been made to determine approximately how many stages each copy is distant from the original, not only by defining its nature on both external and internal grounds, but also by placing it within the context of the normal compositional procedure of similar documents. If other copies of the same text have survived, I have then applied to the extant manuscripts the canons of textual criticism usually employed for literary texts transmitted by Medieval manuscripts. This method has occasionally enabled me to establish:

(a) the relationship between the manuscripts, their ancestor, and whether they were written at dictation or were copied from a model. Particularly interesting results have been obtained by applying the method to documents for which official procedure required multiple copies. Two examples may be given:

1. Petition from Theadelphia, of which two copies (A and B) have survived (refs.: § 3.2.1 no. 4). They were penned by two different scribes employed in the metropolis of the Arsinoite nome (probably in one and the same bureau), but represent valid copies prepared to be forwarded to the competent authority. In other words, this is an original issued in double copy.¹ The significant errors allow the reconstruction of a precise stemma, as follows (I use B's numbering):

- Secure errors of B against A: 3 εστιν (εσμεν A) | 7-8 ομοκω[μ]ητην (-μητῶν A) | 14 omission of εκατον. A is not derived from B.
- Secure errors of A against B: 13 omission of αλλους | 17 dittography of μετα - δυνηθωμεν. B is not derived from A.
- Errors common to A and B: 2 Φιλαδελφιας instead of Θεαδελφ-.²

Both copies come independently from a common ancestor. A's remarkably long dittography at l. 17 suggests that the scribes did not write at dictation but copied out a written model, which must already have been disfigured by the error common to A and B. They also entered the same alteration in l. 13 (αυτῷ A^{ac}B^{ac} : Κυνοπολειτῷ A^{pcsl}B^{pcsl}), which suggests that both copies were corrected against a revised version of the model.³ This implies that the two scribes corrected the errors which had been emended in the model by means of visually well-

¹ For this procedure see Haensch 1994, 493 and 496.

² Cf. J. Rea, *P.Turner* (1981) p. 180.

³ Neither the deletion nor the correction are likely to have occurred in the original version of the ancestor and to have been imported into two mutually independent copies. As regards 9 πεντε AB^{ac} : εξ B^{pcsl} (rightly), there are three possible explanations: (a) the correction was already in the model but was reproduced only by B; (b) it was not in the model but was entered in B when the scribe noticed the error; (c) the correction was entered in the revised text of the model but was noticed only by B's scribe. My reconstruction of the ancestor and the copying/correcting process supports (c) and makes both (a) and (b) improbable (the above objection applies to (a) as well; against (b): apparently A and B were not revised carefully).

distinguishable corrections, but failed to check their own copies carefully. The model is likely to have been the subscriber's draft.

2. Contract from Tebtynis issued in two copies, see § 3.2.1 no. 5 for the references. B's text is generally longer, which excludes $A \rightarrow B$. On the other hand, the longer text of A at 13(7) rules out $B \rightarrow A$. A and B are thus independent copies. This conclusion is corroborated by the divergencies at 8(4) (κληρος / ἀμπυλων) and 11(6) (των / ετων). The latter involves an independently-made, different corruption of one and the same reading (εἰδῶν τῶν),¹ and proves a common, probably written, ancestor.

(b) the authenticity, on stemmatic grounds, of unanimously-transmitted readings in sources subject to a multi-stage manuscript tradition ² as well as in valid duplicates of originals;

(c) a more accurate evaluation of variants.

On the other hand, if a text subject to a manuscript tradition has survived only in one copy (which is by far the commonest case), I have considered possibilities of textual unfaithfulness to the original, but have never been able, of course, either to prove or disprove it. Although elements of uncertainty persist in many cases,³ one must presuppose the correctness of a reading when there are no possibilities of checking its veracity and achieving a judgement of absolute certainty about it. Obviously no more than approximation to the truth is possible in such circumstances.

Slightly more favourable conditions may be offered by copies which display first-hand alterations of linguistic and stylistic character. In such cases, unless the papyrus was checked against a second MS source, either the Π^{ac} readings or the Π^{pc} variants are the model's readings. If it can be proved that the copy descends directly from the original, then either of the two sets of variants can be regarded as original. Their concurrent readings can be attributed to the scribe and can be used as evidence of his own awareness of language. They also provide information on the usage of mutually alternative linguistic phenomena.⁴ An element of subjectivity may persist if there are no objective criteria by which to establish which of two concurrently-transmitted readings should be attributed to whom. This prevents us from gaining full advantage of this type of evidence. On the other hand, if the text was checked against a different MS

¹ Owing to the interchange of Greek voiced and voiceless dentals in Egypt (Gignac I 82; for the explanation of the phenomenon through bilingual interference see 85-86), the ends of both words sounded identically (note B's ετων for -δων).

² Cf. Ch. III § 1.2.1.2.1.

³ For instance, low level features may represent hidden banalisations, whereas high level items may cover attempts to raise an originally lower register. Cf. § 3.4.4.1.3.3.

⁴ On alternative phenomena and their methodological importance for the linguist see § 3.4.4.1.1 below.

from the model, and/or the textual alterations are by a second hand, the identification of the source of each reading becomes more difficult and the linguistic assessment of data is less firm. Evidence on these problems is provided by P.Oxy. XXII 2341, a copy of judicial proceedings of AD 208 which exhibits many first-hand textual alterations,¹ some of which depend on linguistic intervention.

In this case, we know the nature of the copy, its ancestor, and probably also its stemmatic location. The heading (ll. 1-3), written by the same hand as the main body of the document, tells us that the papyrus contains not the complete text of the proceedings, but excerpts taken from the *commentarii* of the prefect of Egypt; in spite of the use of so formal a bookhand as the 'Severe Style', the papyrus is likely to be a private copy. Is it a direct descendant of the copy which was kept in the prefect's bureau? Textual alterations relevant to the language include:

(i) ἁμαρτη[[με]]θέν (ll. 28-29), an aborted innovation stemming from the scribe's pen; apparently he corrected himself just before introducing a perf. pass. (ἁμαρτημένον) in place of the original aor. pass. (ἁμαρτηθέν);

(ii) a number of corrections entered above the line of writing presumably after the text had been copied in full: cf. (a) the correction of a phonological misspelling (l. 28 -χεται Π^{ac} : -χετε Π^c); (b) the substitution of διά + gen. with μετά + gen. as instrumental (l. 8); (c) the substitution of ὅδε with οὗτος (l. 8); (d) the substitution of the impersonal perf. pass. of νομοθετέω ('has been ordained by law') with the impersonal perf. pass. of νομίζω ('is/has been the custom') (ll. 9-10, 15); (e) the substitution of λοιπογραφία ('arrears') with λοιπός ('remainder') (l. 25). The identification of the sources of each pair of concurrent readings rests on subjective grounds. In theory, the scribe may have revised each passage either (A) against the model itself or (B) *suo ingenio*.² A can account for corrections of errors that seem to have originated from miscopying,³ but both A and B can equally represent the source for the restoration of the correct spelling at l. 28. Whichever, other orthographic issues relevant to the linguist remain open.⁴

More serious problems are posed by the linguistic corrections at l. 8, which offer a rare opportunity of investigating in a methodologically appropriate manner (§ 3.4.4.2) the stylistic difference between μετά + gen. and διά + gen. as instrumental,⁵ as well as

¹ Many of these are not recorded in the *ed.pr.* In the following notes, inaccuracies found in the *ed.pr.* will be passed over in silence.

² In my opinion, he is most unlikely to have used a second MS source.

³ Cf. 7 μεμπεσθαι Π^{ac} → πεμπεσθαι Π^c; 13 το Π^{ac} → το'υ' Π^c; especially 13 νομου Π^{ac} → νοτου Π^c (νόμου was probably influenced by νομ- at l. 9); 26-27 Διδυμω στρατηγω Π^{ac} → Διδυμος στρατηγος Π^c (the dative was influenced by Διδύμω at l. 24).

⁴ For instance, if the interlinear correction at l. 6 (ἴσχι) was derived from the model, was its misspelled form caused by internal dictation, or is it the exact reproduction of the model's orthography? Similarly, were other misspellings left uncorrected (cf. ll. 5 [2x], 13, 17, and even 28 [διηλλε- for διηλε-, in the same word as the above orthographic corrections]) because the scribe failed to notice the errors (so probably <ῖ>να at l. 16), or because they did not differ from the spellings found in the ancestor?

⁵ On these constructions cf. Humbert 1930, Browning 1983, 37. διά + gen. is very common in Koine Greek of the Roman period. Secure cases of μετά + gen. as instrumental occur before the second century AD (Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. μετά A III 2 [on Lycurg. 124 see also Kühner-Gerth I 505]; cf. also Radermacher 1925, 141), but according to Browning it

between οὗτος and ὅδε (other literary and non-literary sources provide indecisive information on this issue). Are all the Π^{ac} readings (διό + gen., ὅδε) scribal alterations of the original readings, with which the Π^{pc} variants (μετά + gen., οὗτος) are to be identified? Or conversely, are we to regard one or other Π^{ac} reading as original and its corresponding Π^{pc} variant as due to scribal correction? Unfortunately, the problem defies solution.

Original, but not Autograph

3.2.2. Textual problems may also affect the language and style of those manuscripts which can be defined as originals (§ 3.2.2.2), among which are a large number of petitions and the vast majority of letters. The reason for this lies in the fact that many such manuscripts are not autograph copies (§ 3.2.2.1).

3.2.2.1. A petition consists essentially of the body of the complaint and a validating signature; in a letter, the main body is followed by a salutation formula. In the two types of source, both these component parts, or none of them, or solely the final signature/greeting could be personally penned by the petitioner/sender, depending upon their education and a variety of contingent causes.

(i) Illiterate individuals were not able to write at all, and were therefore unable even to append a signature or an autograph greeting.¹ In practice, however, secure evidence of illiteracy is often hard to detect. In well-preserved petitions, illiterate petitioners are explicitly so described by those who subscribe for them.² The same is not true of private letters. To my knowledge, there is not a single letter, out of the many hundreds published items, in which the sender is described as ἀγράμματος. Furthermore, the evidence is often insufficient to tell whether a letter, in which both the body and the farewell were penned by one and the same hand,

becomes common from the fourth century onwards.

¹ On illiterates (ἀγράμματοι) cf. E. Majer-Leonhard, *Ἀγράμματοι. In Aegypto qui litteras sciverint qui nesciverint ex papyris graecis quantum fieri potest exploratur* (Frankfurt 1913); Calderini 1950; Youtie 1971a = Youtie 1973, 611-627; H.C. Youtie, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 101-108 = Youtie 1981, I 255-262. General discussions of (il)literacy in Rom. and Byz. Egypt include Youtie 1975 = Youtie 1981, II 179-199; E. Wipszyska, 'Le degré d'alphabétisation en Égypte byzantine', *Rev. Ét. Augustiniennes* 30 (1984) 279-296; Harris 1989, esp. 116-146, 276-281, 289 ff.; Hanson 1991; Bowman 1991; K. Hopkins, 'Conquest by Book', in M. Beard et al. (edd.), *Literacy in the Roman World* (*JRA Suppl.* 3, Ann Arbor 1991) 133-158; R. Bagnall 1993, 240-251, 255-260. Cf. also J.G. Keenan, 'On Languages and Literacy in Byzantine Aphrodito', in *Proc. XVIII Int. Congr. Pap.*, II (Athens 1988) 161-167.

² For instance, Aurelius Sakaon, one of the last inhabitants of Theadelphia in the fourth century, is always described as illiterate by the individuals who subscribed his petitions, cf. e.g. P. Sakaon 39.23-24 (AD 318), 43.31-32 (AD 327), 44.20-21 ~ P. Turner 44.20-21 (AD 331/2).

represents the sender's autograph product or the work of a person writing on his behalf; and whether in this case the sender resorted to the services of another individual from occasional motives unrelated to education (see (ii) below) or because he was illiterate.¹ As a result, although it has been argued that illiteracy lies at the root of many non-autograph letters,² the real incidence of the phenomenon is hard to determine.

(ii) (Semi-)literate individuals were expected to append at least an autograph signature at the bottom of petitions and an autograph salutation at the foot of letters. The former was necessary in view of the legal function of petitions, whereas the latter was desirable because the ancients, who 'were fully aware of the personal character of handwriting', viewed autograph greetings as a sign of personal attention.³ Deviations

¹ One such case: Youtie (1976, 194 = Youtie 1981,308) argued that Paniscus (late iii AD) used the services of other people for writing his correspondence (P.Mich. III 214 [= SB III 7247 = *Sel.Pap.* I 155], 216-218 [= SB III 7248-7250], 219 [= SB III 7251]+215 [cf. J. Schwartz, *Aegyptus* 48 (1968) 110], 220 [= SB III 7252]) precisely because he was illiterate. For further examples see Ch. IV § 1.3.4.3. Calderini's statement (1950, 17) that 'non appaiono lettere private fatte scrivere da analfabeti' seems at best inaccurate.

² Cf. Harris 1989, 231. His argument is merely speculative.

³ Cf. 2 *Thess.* 3.17 ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, ὃ ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ; Youtie 1975, 211 with n. 27 (= Youtie 1981, II 189 with n. 27), from which I have taken the quotation. Further evidence of awareness of the personal character of handwriting: (i) Basil.Caes. *ep.* 19.1-3 Courtonne γράμμα ἦλθέ μοι πρόην παρὰ σοῦ, ἀκριβῶς σόν, οὐ τοσοῦτον τῷ χαρακτῆρι τῆς χειρὸς ὅσον τῷ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἰδιώματι 'a letter came to me this morning from you, really a letter of your own not so much because of the character of the handwriting as because of the peculiarity of the missive'; (ii) the collector of Julian's letters, while transcribing them for inclusion in a complete ἐπιστολάριον, specified that Julian had added autograph postscripts to letters penned by others, cf. Iul. *epp.* 9.403b-c (p. 16.16 Bidez) and 11.425d (p. 18.17 Bidez); (iii) copyists who were to transcribe letters for inclusion in the Acts of Ecumenical Councils noticed and signalled changes of hand in connection with the final farewell, cf. ACO III p. 56.19 (no. 20); III p. 59.20 (no. 21); (iv)

Chapter One

from this rule ¹ must have been exceptions presumably caused by contingent impediments (see below). Semi-literates, however, had very limited facility in writing. In petitions and contracts, they are described as 'slow writers' by those who subscribe for them.² They usually refrained from writing valid petitions in their entirety, but could, if they wished, pen not only the epistolary salutations but also entire letters with their unpractised and awkward handwriting.³

Even educated individuals often limited themselves to a signature or a salutation. In letter-writing, this was often a question of personal habit,⁴ but could also depend on contingent factors. A desire for a professionally-made formal-looking manuscript is apparent in a number of cases (§ 3.3.2); tiredness, laziness, and other

in P.Oxy. XVI 1860 (vi/vii AD), the sender asks the recipient for forgiveness (σύνγνωθι) for having the letter written by his son (ll. 13-14): evidently the sender assumes that the recipient is able to recognise his handwriting.

- ¹ Cf. P.Fay. 110, written entirely by a professional scribe although the sender, L. Bellienus Gemellus, was an educated man (cf. § 3.3.1).
- ² On 'slow writers' (βραδέως γράφοντες and the like) cf. Calderini 1950, 34-36; esp. Youtie 1971b = Youtie 1973, 629-651. In particular, on their handwriting see Youtie 1971b, 248 ff. (= Youtie 1973, 638 ff.) (cf. also *GMAW*² p. 2). Their level of inability, however, varied considerably (cf. Cribiore 1996, 102-118 on school-boys' hands), which explains why some unskilled writers could write no more than a few words in a subscription, whereas others penned entire letters (see next n.).
- ³ Salutations: P.Col. VIII 216 (c. AD 100); P.Heid. VII 407 (iv/v AD). Entire letters: SB V 7572 (early ii AD); P.Oxy. LIX 3988 (ii AD ?); P.Oxy. I 119 (ii or iii AD; on the hand see most recently Cribiore 1996, 112 n. 89). Cf. also P.Oxy. XVI 1874 (v AD), the hand of which is neither fluent nor attractive, but seems more competent than that of the other three letters.
- ⁴ Cf. Iul.Vict. *Ars rhet.* 448 p. 106.10-11 Giomini-Celentano *observabant veteres carissimis sua manu scribere vel plurimum subscribere*; Ziemann 1911, 362; Eisner, *P.Iand.* II (1913)

temporary impediments also played a role.¹ However motivated, the decision to entrust other people with the task of writing personal letters was usually regarded as acceptable. It is significant that so many individuals in Egypt, whose handwriting was practised and fluent, penned only the final farewell; that prominent figures in fourth- and fifth-century history and literature, of whom we have extensive collections of letters, occasionally wrote just the salutations and the postscript in their own hand;² and that Basil of Caesarea apparently envisaged as wholly acceptable the possibility that a sophist might use the services of a scribe for writing a letter.³ A different attitude is documented by P.Oxy. XVI 1860 (vi/vii AD),⁴ but this seems to be a rather isolated case.

Occasional motives and personal habit must have also played an important role in petitions. Consider P.Sakaon 44 and P.Turner 44, two copies of one and the same petition of AD 331/332. The man who subscribed to both copies for the illiterate petitioners seems to have drafted the text in advance and to have revised it after it had been copied out (§ 3.2.1.1(a)). Although he was able to employ a very practised, fast cursive, he had the body of the two valid copies penned by two different clerks. Why? Is it a matter of personal habit, or did he want to save time?

Individuals who chose not to employ their own handwriting used the services either of professional scribes, or of their own relatives, or of other people.⁵

3.2.2.2. The ancient practice of entrusting others with the task of writing one's own letters and petitions has an important, yet almost entirely neglected, bearing on the assessment of language. There is evidence to show that individuals who lent their

p. 41; Deissmann 1923, 132 n. 6; Youtie 1976, 194 (= Youtie 1981, II 308); Bowman 1991, 127, 129.

¹ Tiredness: Iul. ep. 28.382a-b (p. 55.3-5 Bidez). Laziness: Basil.Caes. ep. 20.7 ff. Courtonne; Iul. ep. 96.374d (p. 176.11-13 Bidez). Painful arm: SPP XX 128 (AD 428). Other impediments: Calderini 1950, 24 (cf. 36); Youtie 1971b, 251-252 (= Youtie 1973, 641-642).

² Salutations: Hormisd. ep. ad clerum et archimandr. Secundae Syriae, ACO III p. 56.19 (no. 20); ep. ad Epiph., ACO III p. 59.20 (no. 21). Postscripts: Iul. epp. 9.403b-c (p. 16.16 ff. Bidez) and 11.425d (p. 18.17 ff. Bidez). Julian's ep. 96 was dictated to a scribe, cf. Iul. ep. 96.374d (p. 176.11-13 Bidez).

³ Cf. Basil.Caes. ep. 20.7 ff. Courtonne.

⁴ The writer, an educated man, asks for forgiveness for resorting to his son for writing the letter (ll. 13-14). Note that his son is literate and uses a fluent, professional sloping cursive.

⁵ On availability of scribes in Egypt cf. Youtie 1971a, 165 (= Youtie 1973, 615); Youtie 1975, 216 ff. (= Youtie 1981, I 194 ff.); Hanson 1991, 176. Exx. of petitions and letters penned by scribes: for petitions cf. e.g. P.Sakaon 44 and P.Turner 44 (§ 3.2.1.1(a)); for letters cf. e.g. P.Oxy. XLVIII 3415 (the fluent, professional handwriting points to a clerk

services to educated men could enter many alterations of their own while copying out a drafted text or writing at dictation.¹ It is thus advisable, when assessing the language of non-autograph originals, to form an idea of who is responsible for what. Zilliacus (1943, 26) stated the principle that phonologically significant misspellings, other orthographic errors, and small morphological irregularities must be attributed to scribes. This is now supported by actual evidence. In the letter P.Oxy. LIX 4002 (iv/v AD), palaeography shows that the sender, a *scholasticus*, got a professional clerk to write the body of his letter. Then he personally penned the end and the farewell. The clerk incurred a number of phonological misspellings, some of which were emended by the sender at a later stage.² He restored the correct spelling of the 3rd pers. sing. pres. ind. act. endings (ll. 4,9), of *τρεῖς* (l. 6), of *ἀπέστειλα* (l. 5), all of which had been misspelled under the influence of *iotacism*. But he left uncorrected several other such errors and a few misspellings *ε* for *α*; unemended misspelled forms comprise *ἡμεῖν* (ll. 11,12) and the stem vowel in the aor. subj. and imp. of *ἀποστέλλω* (ll. 7,11,12,15). Evidently the sender made an accurate revision until l. 6 only, then he went through the written text very cursorily and corrected only an error (l. 9) which for some reason attracted his attention. Similarly, the first-century letter SB XVI 12322 displays four supralinear second-hand corrections,³ three of which (ll. 3 [2x], 6) aim to restore the *iota adscript*, one to emend a misspelling caused by *iotacism* (l. 5 *τάχι* → *τάχει*).

These papyri are excellent illustrations of how in non-autograph originals not only the spelling of inflectional endings and stem vowels, but also all the linguistic data that variously relate to phonology and orthography may misrepresent what

of the bureau of the *praepositus pagi*); Iul. ep. 28.382a-b (p. 55.3-5 Bidez) (scribes working at the imperial palace). Sons writing letters for their *fully literate* fathers: P.Oxy. XVI 1860 (vi/vii AD). Illiterates and semi-literates using the services of relatives and other reliable people for writing and/or subscribing to contracts and petitions: Calderini 1950, 30-32,36; Youtie 1971a, 171 (= Youtie 1973, 621); Youtie 1975, 213 ff. (= Youtie 1981, 191 ff.); Hanson 1991, 164,168.

- ¹ In § 3.2.1.1(a), I cited cases of petitions and contracts presumably copied out from the subscribers' own drafts, in which several readings can be explained as scribal alterations to the model. As regards private letters, cf. P.Oxy. LIX 4002 and P.Ant. I 44 (see below).
- ² For an excellent discussion of the hands as well as of the palaeographical and phonological aspects of the corrections see H.G. Ioannidou, *P.Oxy. LIX* (1992) pp. 162, 164.
- ³ Apparently they were regarded by the editors as the work of the main hand, but a glance at the published photograph (BASP 16 [1979] pl. 4) shows a remarkable difference between the epsilon of *τάχ'εί* and all the other epsilons. This contrast is unlikely to depend on the use of different types of script by one and the same scribe. Unfortunately, as the papyrus is broken at the foot, no comparison can be drawn between the suprascripts and the farewell, in which the sender probably employed his own

epistolographers and petitioners wished to use. In consequence, even individual attestations of orthographic variants relevant to purism may not reflect the author's real attitude to purism. This is especially true of variants that diverge orthographically but were pronounced identically in speech: cases in point are not only the purely orthographic variations of the type *χρέος/χρέως*, but also the orthographic variants that convey, in addition, divergent choices in the realm of morphology and syntax (e.g. the subj./opt. of the type *λείπη/λείποι*). The same uncertainties, I believe, may as well apply to strictly orthographic variations which do not involve any identity of the sounds that are represented by the different graphemes (type *cc/ττ*). In such cases, scribal alterations can produce either banalisations or Atticisations of the original readings (cf. § 3.4.4.1.3.3).

Zilliacus further asserted that composers must in turn be held responsible for vocabulary and sentence structure. In fact, the numerous occurrences of scribal alterations to syntax, vocabulary, and word order in non-literary sources subject to a copying process (§ 3.2.1.1) suggest that even these aspects may have been liable to alterations in non-autograph originals.

The problem is to determine not only what scribes might have altered, but also how far authors noticed and approved of the changes. Paul Maas once stated the principle that 'a dictation revised by the author must be regarded as equivalent to an autograph manuscript' of that author.¹ This is certainly true, but is regrettably of little or no practical help to us. P.Oxy. 4002 and SB 12322 show that there were individuals who actually decided to revise what others had written down on their behalf,² but there is no reason to believe that *all* the non-autograph letters and petitions were read through before being signed, nor does the absence of traces of revision necessarily imply a failure to undertake and fulfil the corresponding process. Furthermore, as P.Oxy. 4002 seems to show, the revision, if undertaken at all, may have been carried out cursorily or with desultory attention. This makes it still harder to determine, in the absence of evident signs of revision, how much the author cared about the text.

Further issues are raised by those texts in which the author, while correcting errors altering the original sense of his message, disregarded the form,

handwriting.

¹ P. Maas, *Textual Criticism* (Oxford 1958) 1 (§ 1) = 'Textkritik', in Gercke-Norden (edd.), *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, I³ 2 (Leipzig-Berlin 1927) 1.

² Similarly, in SPP XX 128 (AD 487) Aur. Sambas declares that he has read the text through and has found it satisfactory (l. 8 ἀναγνοὺς ἐξ ὧλωκλήρου καὶ ἀρεσθής), cf. Youtie 1971b, 252 (= Youtie 1973, 642). Cf. the habit of reading out documents to contracting parties with little or no ability to read (Youtie 1971b, 254 = Youtie 1973, 644). On P.Ant. I 44 see below.

including mere linguistic blunders. This may depend either on an inadequate level of education and command of Greek or a deliberate choice. P.Ant. I 44 (iv/v AD), recently re-edited by J. Rea (1996), seems to supply evidence of the former. The body of the letter was presumably penned by a professional clerk, whereas the sender added an autograph postscript and the farewell in his own hand. He also seems to have restored the correct sense at l. 8,¹ which the scribe had inadvertently marred by omitting a negation. It seems, therefore, that the sender read through and checked up on what the clerk had written. Yet he did not emend the misspellings, presumably because, as his own more serious misspellings show, he had little command of Greek orthography.

3.2.2.2.1. Texts could be read out to illiterates so that they could express a judgement on the content of what had been written down on their behalf;² but they had certainly no capacity for linguistic and stylistic revision. This shifts the question of the responsibility for the compositional choices onto the individuals who wrote for the illiterates. The bearing on the sociology of language is self-evident. In petitions, the identity and sometimes the trade of subscribers are declared explicitly, so that a certain amount of background can occasionally be reconstructed even for those who lent their services to illiterate petitioners. Just as in complaints of educated individuals, the responsibility for the linguistic and stylistic choices varies according to whether the body was penned by the subscriber himself or by a scribe. Instead, letters require much caution because of the problems posed by their compositional procedure. As indicated earlier (§ 3.2.2.1(i)), there is often no clue to the sender's literacy, and even if it can be proved with reasonable certainty that he was illiterate, the individual who wrote for him remains anonymous and his social and cultural background is unknown.

¹ For the identification of the hand responsible for this correction see Rea 1996, 191 *ad loc.*

² Cf. p. 39 n. 2.

3.3. PALAEOGRAPHY AS ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

3.3.1. Palaeography often provides essential information on the framework of linguistic performance. As has been pointed out earlier, it is of primary importance for the correct assessment of the language of individual sources to establish identities or distinctions of hands not only between different papyri (cf. § 3.1.3), but also within one and the same manuscript (cf. § 3.2.1). Such judgements are often secure, but in many cases they are much less so. Many well-trained individuals were able to use both slowly-written formal capitals and very fast cursive styles,¹ and they could adopt different degrees of cursivity and legibility according to circumstances.² Variations of cursivity are often found even within the same manuscript.³ In addition, personal handwriting was subject to changes in the course of time and to variations caused by psychological factors.⁴ All these facts invite caution in assuming distinction or identity of hands between written forms which are neither perfectly identical nor totally dissimilar in terms of modulus, ductus, and formation of individual letters.

3.3.2. The character of handwriting, in particular its degree of skill and (in)formality, may throw light on several points of interest. In non-original documents, for instance, palaeography and the layout of the manuscript may give tentative indications of whether the copies are the product of official bureaus or of private individuals for their own personal use.⁵ In autograph originals, the handwriting gives an idea of the writers' level of literacy, and thereby may supply information relevant to language. But one needs to treat the relationship between script and linguistic performance with much caution. Unskilled writers were of course unable to produce high level compositions, but educated individuals could both aim high linguistically and limit themselves to unsophisticated utterances, even without making grammatical and orthographical errors (cf. § 3.4.3). The degree of skill of handwriting may thus happen to be higher than the chosen level of linguistic and stylistic refinement of the text. Byzantine letters occur which are penned in professional cursive script but display very

¹ For instance, Dioscorus of Aphroditos, the well-known lawyer and poet (Ch. III § 2.2.4), used a sloping majuscule script for writing most of his literary pieces and a professional upright cursive in documents: cf. e.g. Mac Coull 1988, pl. 10.

² Cf., for instance, Hanson 1991, 173.

³ Cf. e.g. App. (A) I 13 and 25. The same is true of many literary papyri.

⁴ Variations in the course of time: Grenfell-Hunt-Hogarth, *P.Fay.* (1900) p. 262. Variations caused by changes in mood: van Minnen 1994, 246.

⁵ Cf. § 3.2.1.1; but see the observations on P.Oxy. XXII 2341.

incorrect orthography and grammar:¹ evidently scribal training and grammatical and rhetorical education could follow separate routes in the Byzantine period.² Furthermore, peculiar types of handwriting are not necessarily associated with idiosyncratic language, and vice versa.³

Caution must also be used when resorting to information contributed by palaeography for the assessment of the language of non-autograph originals, including papyrus letters written in literary hands and/or equipped with graphic devices characteristic of literary manuscripts.⁴ The use of lectional signs such as accents, breathings, quantity marks, and reference marks in private correspondence seems particularly remarkable, since even in literary papyri they are usually confined to verse texts, especially lyric poetry; prose manuscripts are generally free of them.⁵ Punctuation may also be noteworthy, if it is used either repeatedly or consistently. Thus, in papyrus letters the complementary presence of bookhands and lectional signs (App. (A) III) and even a repeated use of the latter only (App. (A) II 4,10,13,14) seem to stem from a desire to provide the epistolary manuscript with literary respectability. In almost all such published letters, the linguistic and stylistic level of performance is higher than average.⁶ Elements of refined language are also found in some of the letters characterised only by literary hands.⁷ In all these cases, therefore, there is a clear correlation between palaeography and language. Both are artificial: the writers' desire for literary respectability led not only to their demand for an elegant presentation of

¹ Cf. e.g. P.Oxy. LVI 3859 (iv AD); P.Herm. 15 (late iv/early v AD); P.Herm. 17 (v/vi AD); P.Oxy. LVI 3870 (vi/vii AD); LIX 4008 (vi/vii AD).

² The editor of P.Oxy. 4008 comments: 'the mixture of respectable appearance and low level of literacy is what we might expect on the working fringes of high society'.

³ Thus, for instance, in P.Oxy. XLVIII 3403, a fourth-century private letter, the script is quite crabbed and idiosyncratic, but the language is a standard non-literary Greek with no sign of idiosyncrasy.

⁴ For lists of such letters see Appendix (A).

⁵ A remarkable exception is P.Oxy. LXII 4321 (Demosthenes, ii AD), in which the use of lectional signs is so heavy as to call for an explanation: the editors suggested that 'the text had been prepared for school use'.

⁶ P.David 14 (App. (A) III 1): cf. Ch. IV § 1.3.2; P.Herm. 4-5 (App. (A) III 3): cf. Ch. IV § 1.3.4.3; P.Oxy. 2603 (App. (A) III 4): cf. Ch. IV § 1.3.3; P.Oxy. I 122 (App. (A) II 4): cf. Ch. IV § 1.2.2; P.Herm. 2 (App. (A) II 10): cf. Ch. IV § 1.3.4.1; P.Herm. 6 (App. (A) II 13): cf. Ch. IV § 1.3.4.2; P.Ryl. IV 624 (App. (A) II 14): cf. Ch. IV § 1.3.4.2. P.Ross.Georg. III 2 (App. (A) III 2) is an exception.

⁷ P.Mil.Vogl. I 11 (App. (A) I 3) is an excellent example: cf. Ch. IV § 1.3.1. Indicators of more

Chapter One

the manuscript at the cost of higher expenses,¹ but also to their choice of refined language and style.

On the other hand, literary hands were also used to pen linguistically and stylistically unsophisticated papyrus letters.² Various factors may account for this contrast. I suspect, for instance, that scribes could be chosen irrespective of the type of writing they were able to use. Thus, the use of bookhands may not necessarily be an indication of a distinct literary ambition at all. Moreover, although wishing for a formal-looking manuscript, and accordingly instructing a well-trained scribe to use a literary hand, an individual could nevertheless fail to elevate the level of linguistic refinement either because of an incapacity to handle the resources of literary Greek,³ or perhaps because he regarded homogeneity between script and language as unnecessary.

tenuous refinement are found in P.Haun. II 16 (App. (A) I 13), see Ch. III §§ 1.2.1.2.3, 1.3.3 (IV).

¹ In antiquity, the cost of writing was dependent upon its quality. Diocletian's *Edictum de pretiis* fixed the price for 100 lines of writing at 25 denarii if the writing was of the best quality, at 20 denarii if the writing was second quality (col. vii 39-40). Turner, *GMAW*² p. 23 suggested regarding the hand responsible for P.Herm. 4 and 5 (App. (A) I 23) as a specimen of the second class. If that is correct, the cost of writing in P.Herm. 5 will have been c. 6 denarii. The average letters will have cost much the same as petitions or legal documents, the price of which was fixed by Diocletian's edict at 10 denarii per 100 lines (col. vii 41). Had P.Herm. 5 been written in an informal cursive, it would probably have cost approximately 3 denarii, that is to say, half the price that may have been actually paid.

² Cf. App. (A) I 1,2,4,5,7,8,10,11,12,15,16,18,19,20,24.

³ Letters in which awareness of stylistic registers is not accompanied by adequate linguistic competence will be discussed in Ch. IV § 1.2.

3.4. SOME BASIC PRINCIPLES OF LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

3.4.1. There are fewer discussions of methods of linguistic analysis as applicable to Greek post-classical prose than one might expect. The existing ones vary considerably in form and extension,¹ and fail to address a large number of important issues. While being aware that the topic would require, and indeed deserves, an extensive and detailed treatment of its own, I shall provide some guidelines for the methodological principles followed in the present thesis, which I have developed through constant interaction with actual evidence.

3.4.2. The linguistic and stylistic texture not only of the majority of post-classical Greek literary prose writings but also of many non-literary papyri is a complex amalgam of elements with different origins. The task of detecting the various component parts requires an appropriate method of analysis (§ 3.4.2.1) and a sensible approach (§ 3.4.2.2).² Both should as far as possible be applied to texts and passages of reasonably secure authorship and degree of originality (§ 3.2).

3.4.2.1. In principle, consistent use should be made of a strictly inductive method.³ Starting from details and proceeding progressively to increasingly general inferences, a separate assessment should be made (1) of each linguistic and stylistic feature within each text; (2) of each text as a whole within the written production of each individual; (3) of each writer in general; (4) of each writer in relation to his predecessors and contemporaries. This procedure involves two crucial stages. One is to assess individual items, thus allowing us to characterise the style of an entire document (no. 1). The other is to evaluate the linguistic and stylistic usage of individual writers in relation both to single phenomena and to entire texts within their production (no. 3). As evidence is frequently scanty, further methodological clarification (§ 3.4.4 ff.) and a brief comment on the legitimacy of generalisations (§ 3.4.3) are needed.

3.4.2.2. A correct approach to evidence requires both flexibility and prudence. An attempt should be made to test different interpretations for each aspect under examination in order to minimise the risks of one-sided constructions. If no choice can be made on objective grounds, it is essential to refrain from drawing

¹ Cf. Fabricius 1962, 20 ff.; Hult 1990, 18 ff.; Wahlgren 1995, 11-20. Frösén 1974 (esp. 191 ff.) is self-consciously theoretical, but is full of sensible observations as Browning, *CR* n.s. 26 (90) (1976) 228 conceded. Further valuable remarks will be found in several articles and monographs.

² The target of the following methodological notes will be mainly the non-literary papyri, but many observations are also applicable to secular and Christian prose literature.

³ Cf. Frösén 1974, 10 ff., 40, 222.

deductions of general interest from subjective judgements. It is equally important to avoid generalisations on the basis of insufficient evidence. In my opinion, to concede *non liquet* is better than building upon sand.

3.4.3. Educated individuals in antiquity were capable of adopting different modes of expressing one and the same idea, although in practice their ability to handle the tools of language and style varied considerably.¹ Evidence shows that people with varying degrees of skill in Greek prose composition made deliberate attempts to diversify elements of style in relation to circumstances (Ch. IV). Even superficial acquaintance with rhetoric provided writers with awareness that style is no unchangeable monolith.² In each piece of writing, therefore, every element of its linguistic and stylistic form must in principle be regarded as no more than a solution adopted in a particular circumstance, which the writer may or may not have reproduced (or have wished to reproduce) elsewhere; and each text as a whole is the product of a choice, which may or may not have been repeated in the same form in other circumstances.³ I firmly believe that it is unwise to make general assertions on the Greek of an educated writer on the grounds of the evidence supplied by a single document. Indeed, the larger the number of texts used, the more detailed and more accurate (and less subjective) the analysis. In practice, however, the minimum number of items required varies according to the specific problems posed by the phenomena under examination and to the purposes and targets of the inquiries. In compliance with this principle, I have tried to use sets of prose texts composed by one and the same individual whenever possible (cf. § 3.1.3), and I shall refrain from putting too much weight on arguments based on limited evidence if the use of a fair number of papyri by one and the same writer is a *sine qua non* for the reliability of assertions.

These observations apply to sources written by educated writers, whether for themselves or on behalf of other people. On the other hand, as semi-literates were unable to vary the style of performance, texts arguably written by them (§ 3.2.2.1(ii)) can be regarded as evidence of the only compositional style they were able to use. In such cases, profit can be gained even from a single text, if that is the only surviving item of evidence. (In general, however, one must remember that a single papyrus text, especially a letter, may not supply firm information on the writer's level of education and/or the authorship of the text (§ 3.1.3), both of which ought to be determined before

¹ On competence and its influence upon written performance see esp. Frösén 1974, 17 (with bibliography), 138-140, 141-142. Cf. also Wahlgren 1995, 13.

² On letter-writing see Ch. II §§ 2-3.

³ On selection as a function of competence and as a fundamental component of prose composition cf. Frösén 1974, 17-18, 139 ff. Cf. also Wahlgren 1995, 13.

assessing the language of the text concerned (§ 3.4.2).)

3.4.4. As we shall see, prose composition is the outcome of a blend of deliberate choices and instinctive mental processes. One must in every text try to determine the proportion of the mixture, although, in general, the higher the level of artificiality of performance, the stronger the impact of meditated choices on grammar and style. This involves assessing the reason behind the choice of each particular feature within a text. As no background information is supplied by the sources themselves, one must try to detect motivations below the surface of written performance by means of a comparative method (§ 3.4.4.1) and the study of author's corrections (§ 3.4.4.2). The level of approximation to the truth that can be achieved by means of this methodology depends on a large number of factors and varies according to circumstances.

3.4.4.1. Principles of comparative analysis form the framework upon which many important studies of post-classical Greek are based; they are also outlined in a handful of contributions.¹ It is important to point out, however, their rather complicated mechanisms and their intrinsic weaknesses (§ 3.4.4.1.1 ff.).

3.4.4.1.1. The inquiry should focus on alternative formulations (or 'variants').² The influence of registers of style, or of any other stylistic factor, on the use/non-use of a specific feature should be determined by examining the frequency of that feature versus the frequency of other equivalent words, modes of expression, and constructions. The basic criteria of equivalence are (i) the identity of meaning and/or grammatical function, (ii) the analogy of stylistic function. Together, they guarantee that the selection of the most appropriate variant was determined only by the stylistic factor under examination. Thus, for instance, they prevent one from attributing to the influence of registers of style choices of words that were in fact affected by lexical and grammatical factors, or by stylistic factors linked to context.³

Both criteria, however, are in themselves subject to some degree of uncertainty. There is a danger, for instance, that supposedly synonymous words may still have differed in shades of meaning. This can hardly be verified on the basis of such brief and concise sources as, say, the papyrus letters. The same may be true of syntactical constructions.⁴ Synonymy is in general hard to define.⁵ Furthermore, it may

¹ Cf. Fabricius 1962, 20-21; Hult 1990, 18 ff.; Wahlgren 1995, 12 ff.

² Cf. Fabricius 1962, 24; Frösén 1974, 40; Hult 1990, 18-20; G. Thomas 1991, 170; Wahlgren 1995, 18-19; Dover 1997, 12-21.

³ On context as a factor influencing word choice see Wahlgren 1995, 19 (cf. also 13).

⁴ Cf. Hult 1990, 19.

be difficult to formulate reliable judgements on the exact stylistic function of a word or a construction (cf. § 3.4.4.2).

In theory, the procedure outlined in § 3.4.2.1 (esp. no. 3) would require taking due account of variants occurring in the repertoire of the individual responsible for the text under consideration. This would permit us to assess his performance in the light of his linguistic competence.¹ It is generally hard, however, to reconstruct the repertoire of an individual on the basis of his surviving composition or compositions, since even where more than one text is extant, they are few and short (cf. § 3.4.3). Nor can competence be determined by relying on the usually limited possibilities of defining the level of education on non-linguistic grounds. One cannot dispense with focusing on the range of variants offered by the language repertoire of contemporaries. This may generate misjudgements in questions of detail, because there is no good reason to assume the existence of a full overlap between personal linguistic competence and the range of possibilities offered by the repertoire of the language system (cf. § 4.3). The methodological weakness is evident: while seeking to determine the general situation of Greek at a particular period through an analysis of individuals, one has eventually to resort to the as yet undefined general usage of Greek to explain the uses of individuals (cf. § 3.4.4.1.2).

Notwithstanding the intrinsic difficulties of the method, failure to work on alternative formulations generally results in speculative assertions and entails considerable risks of misjudgement. Simple occurrences of words, moods, tenses, and the like may be of help at times, but generally prove nothing if no attempt is made to assess evidence for their variants, and to take not only the lexical value but also the grammatical and stylistic functions of each attestation into consideration.²

3.4.4.1.2. The procedure requires a preliminary assessment of whether the

⁵ Cf. Wahlgren 1995, 18: 'dann entsteht aber die Frage, was man unter Synonymie versteht'. Modern definitions of synonymy are gathered by Calboli 1964-65, 52-56. An ancient definition relevant to the present discussion is [Dion. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* 12, *Gramm. Gr.* I 1, p. 36.5 Uhlig συνώνυμον δέ ἐστι τὸ ἐν διαφόροις ὀνόμασι τὸ αὐτὸ δηλοῦν οἷον ἄορ ξίφος μάχαιρα σπάθη φάσγανον [φάσγ. σπ. P.Hal. 55a = *GPGRE* 4]: cf. Desbordes (below) p. 96; Calboli 1989, 170. In general, on ancient grammatical and rhetorical theories of synonymy cf. Calboli 1964-65 (esp. 28-34); F. Desbordes, 'Homonymie et synonymie d'après les textes théoriques latins', in I. Rosier (ed.), *L'ambiguïté* (Lille 1988) 51-102; Calboli 1989.

¹ Cf. the observations of Hult 1990, 20, although she appears to draw no distinction between personal competence of individuals and the repertoire offered by the language system. On linguistic competence see the literature cited in § 3.4.3. On the notion of 'repertoire' cf. Gomperz's definition cited by Frösén 1974, 18.

² Unfortunately, this is a major weak point common to many investigations of post-classical Greek which have made much use of word-lists.

occurrences of the linguistic and stylistic variants that have been selected for comparison are sufficiently equivalent (§ 3.4.4.1.1) for their reciprocal comparison to yield promising results. Once this prerequisite is fulfilled, the comparative method proper can be applied. In view of its mechanisms, a particular feature can be characterised (i) positively, by crediting it with the characteristics that supposedly pertain to texts in which it is attested on a large scale (in comparison, of course, with other equivalent variants, cf. § 3.4.4.1.1); (ii) negatively, by denying it the characteristics of texts in which it is either little-attested or not-attested at all (again, in comparison with other equivalent variants).¹ The comparison thus operates not only among mutually equivalent variants (§ 3.4.4.1.1), but also among a variety of texts (§ 3.4.4.1.3).

The method has intrinsic weaknesses. As Karin Hult has pointed out,² there is a danger of circular reasoning. The comparative procedure requires the use of authors and texts to assess the variants and the incidence of stylistic factors on their choice, but at the same time the variants must be used to support the characterisation of authors and texts in compliance with the requirements of the inductive method (§ 3.4.2.1, esp. no. 1). As a result, we may get entangled in the paradoxical situation in which what needs to be assessed is used to assess the criteria of assessment! (cf. § 3.4.4.1.1) There are of course many instances of texts and features whose general characterisation can be established with reasonable certainty, even in the presence of circular arguments, thanks to the availability of abundant and coherent data. But there are countless borderline cases which allow no such confidence, especially if the analysis enters into details. I shall now focus on some exemplary situations.

1. Difficult issues may be raised by occasional occurrences of a feature in texts which seem otherwise to pursue different stylistic aims from those common to the sources in which it is extensively found. For instance, how should we assess the attestations of 'classicistic' items in unpretentious prose or of predominantly non-literary phenomena in 'classicising' prose? Do these occurrences affect the evaluation of the features or of the texts? ³ I believe that each case must be weighed on its own merits.

2. General characterisations based on 'abundant and coherent' data may not account for individual cases. My discussion of the use of pleonastic λέγων before

¹ Cajus Fabricius' description (1962, 21) of how to detect what is unclassical and what is classicising post-classical Greek is illuminating in this respect. Cf. also Wahlgren 1995, 12.

² Hult 1990, 21. Her suggested method of avoiding circular arguments, however, is unclear to me.

³ Hult 1990, 21 rightly observes: 'if a 'non-literary' variant should occur in Theodoret, does that affect the stylistic evaluation of the variant or of Theodoret?'

quoted speech in P.Mil.Vogl. I 24 and BGU II 523 (Ch. IV § 1.2.1) will serve as a good example. In fact, frequency and coherence are not absolute notions and, therefore, may not represent sufficient criteria of assessment. The same abundant and coherent evidence illustrating one phenomenon in specific circumstances may be unable to explain occurrences of the same feature in different contexts.

3. In any case, the comparative method cannot work on incoherent and/or quantitatively insufficient evidence. This kind of material may generate uncertainties about the evaluation of details, and also about the general characterisation of a text if it displays a high proportion of incoherently distributed or scarcely attested variants. The use of such evidence for comparison entails considerable risks of misjudgement.

4. There are a large number of either little-investigated or ill-studied post-classical prose writings (cf. 3.4.4.1.3). Assessments of alternative variants based in part or in full on the evidence supplied by such insufficiently classified sources are unreliable.

5. The linguistic usage of model authors and texts was regarded in antiquity as a criterion of language correctness and a guide to good usage; the Atticist lexica, for example, are based on this principle.¹ Disagreements on models could result in dissenting evaluations of individual linguistic features and in divergent choices in writing. As a consequence, background information about each writer's preferred models of good usage would be useful correctly to assess features whose use in preference to other equivalent variants was, or may have been, the fruit of intentional choices. But such information is usually neither available nor detectable. The kind of misjudgements that inevitably occur can be illustrated by the following observations on 'classicisms' in the second and third centuries AD.

Atticist lexicographers often diverged in their evaluations of linguistic phenomena. Mild Atticists, such as the so-called Antiatticist, deemed to be puristic forms, words, and usages which strict Atticist lexicographers such as Phrynichus did not accept.² More precisely, the target of their dissent is the recognition of individual occurrences in pre-Hellenistic literature as valid models of puristic usage. Disagreements generally depend on (A) the varying range of authors and texts

¹ In general, on language correctness in antiquity cf. Siebenborn 1976 and the literature on ἑλληνισμός cited at Ch. III § 1.1.1.

² On the Antiatticist (ed. I. Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* I [1814] 77-116) as an example of mild Atticism cf. Latte 1915, 383-384 (= 1968, 620-621); Tosi 1988, 181 n. 23; Swain 1996, 53. For the relationship between the Antiatticist and Phrynichus' *Ecloga* cf. Latte 1915, 373 ff. (= 1968, 612 ff.); Fischer 1974, 39-41, 45-46; Argyle 1989, 529.

recognised as suitable sources of puristic words,¹ (B) divergent views on the minimum required frequency of occurrence for a feature to be accepted as puristic,² (C) problems of textual authenticity.³ Yet purists did not refrain even from (D) apodictic assertions.⁴ In consideration of these controversies, as well as of the multiplicity of possible causes of dissent even among the promoters of purism, and the problems inherent in the assessment of data, it is often difficult to pronounce upon the attitude of a Koine writer to individual linguistic features the use of which in actual performance may have been determined by both non-puristic orientations and hidden puristic attitudes. In principle, every standard post-classical feature of which occasional attestations are found in pre-Hellenistic literature may have been deemed puristic. The following two examples have been selected to illustrate the uncertainties about the puristic recognition of standard post-classical usages. The first example is circumstantial; the second draws attention to a phenomenon for which there is very slender evidence in classical Greek, and is meant as an extreme (and rather theoretical) case.

I. The occasional classical use of the 3rd pers. plur. of the refl. pronoun instead of the 1st may have provided individuals with puristic justifications for borrowing it in their own writings: cf. § 3.4.4.1.3.3 'on the 'Demosthenic' declamation P.Oxy. XLV 3235. It may be noted that Antiatt. 77.7-8 Bekker supplies evidence of a controversy among Atticist lexicographers about the degree of purity inherent in the use of the 3rd pers. sing. of the refl. pronoun instead of the 1st and 2nd (exx. in Attic prose: Kühner-Gerth I 572).

II. ἴνα after verbs denoting a command, a desire, a request, a recommendation, and the like, develops in post-classical Greek as a non-classicistic

¹ For a recent survey of the Atticist controversies about sources see Swain 1996, 53-56.

² Cf. e.g. Phryn. *Ecl.* 206 Fischer. In general, the Antiatticist seems to have attached greater importance to occasional occurrences than did Phrynichus.

³ An illuminating example. Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 231 Fischer) criticised the rhetor Cornelianus, the addressee of his *Ecloga* and possibly the author of *Philetaerus* (Argyle 1989), for suggesting a passage of Demosthenes' spurious oration *Against Neaera* ([Dem.] 59.74) in favour of a non-puristic word (βασιλίσσα), cf. § 3.4.4.1.3.3. Cf. also Phryn. *Ecl.* 255 Fischer. Contrast e.g. *Ecl.* 264, where Phrynichus cited Pseudo-Demosthenes' *Against Phormion* with approval. In general, one must try to determine whether purists accepted supposedly spurious texts as models of good usage (i) because they regarded problems of authenticity as irrelevant, or (ii) on account of unawareness of (or dissent about) the possible spuriousness. As regards Phrynichus, *Ecl.* 231 and 255 speak against (i) in *Ecl.* 264 and elsewhere. A frequently unsurmountable problem is to determine the views of a purist (let alone of an unknown writer) on the authenticity of specific writings (for the 'Demosthenic' orations, M.J. Lossau, *Untersuchungen zur antiken Demosthenesexegese* [Palingenesia 2, Berlin 1964] 67-86 will be of use although he focuses on Alexandrian scholarship).

⁴ Cf. the tenor of Phrynichus' judgements in *Ecl.* 123, 145, 190, 297 Fischer.

variant of the (acc. and) inf., which is normal in classical Greek (cf. e.g. Kühner-Gerth II 6-8, Schwyzer II 374-375).

In the Hellenistic period, ἵνα displays varying degrees of frequency according to the stylistic pretension of the sources.¹ In the first to second centuries AD, it occurs predominantly outside high-level classicising prose.² In general, the (acc. and) inf. is retained in any kind of prose in proportion to its classicising pretension, cf. (besides the above bibl.) Hult 1990, 149 ff. and 232-244, where the use of ἵνα versus the inf. is visualised verb by verb. For the later centuries cf. Hult 1990, 156, 171-172, 231-244; Aalto 1953, 100-101; App. (B) § 1.8 A no. 1.

However, the analytical construction has clear precursors in classical literature: (a) ἵνα occurs in Hom. *Od.* 3.327 (after λίσσομαι; cf. *ibid.* 3.19) and in Dem. *De cor.* 155 (after ὀξίω, as often in Koine) in a forged document (cf. Koch 1909, 19); (b) the parallel construction ὅπως (ᾧν) + finite vb. after *verba iubendi, volendi* etc. is well-attested in Thuc., Plato, Antiph., Isae., Xen.³ It is possible that in the Roman period ἵνα could be occasionally inspired by one or other of these occurrences,⁴ and that it could be deemed acceptable, even by individuals who wished to depart from the contemporary standard language, either (i) as a good class. usage, if the writer was uninterested in strict purism or was incapable of attaining to it, or possibly (ii) as a synonym for good Attic ὅπως.

6. In spite of a countless number of studies which aim to illustrate grammatical and stylistic aspects of the language of unpretentious prose (both literary and non-literary), no accurate diachronic and synchronic descriptions of the multifaceted nature of standard language in the time of Roman and Byzantine Koine are available to us (§ 4.4; cf. § 1.2); and little attempt has been made to define the

¹ Inscriptions: Aalto 1953, 100; de Foucault 1972, 188. Papyri: Mayser II 1, p. 243-244 and Aalto, cit. LXX: Turner, *Syntax* 104. Polybius: Aalto 1953, 98-99; de Foucault 1972, 188. Letter of Aristeeas: Meecham 1935, 132.

² Papyri: Serz 1920, 62-63; Aalto 1953, 100; Mandilaras 1973 §§ 584 and 586. *NT* and other sources: Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 392, 1a-f; Turner, *Syntax* 103-104; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ἵνα II 1a δ; Aalto 1953, 99. Novels: occurrences are significantly found only in Chariton, whereas other writers used the infinitive consistently (Papanikolaou 1973, 149-150). For the scarce attestations in classicising prose cf. Hult 1990, 156 with refs.; Aalto 1953, 99. Exx. will be discussed at App. (B) § 1.4.

³ Stahl 1907, 568; Kühner-Gerth II 9; Hult 1990, 157. Cf. Kalén 1941, 26 ff.

⁴ Papyri testify to the popularity of Hom., Dem., Thuc., Plat., Xen. in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Demosthenes' forged documents are generally preserved in papyri of *De corona* (for exceptions cf. C.H. Roberts, *P.Ant.* I [1950] p. 66; add PSI XIV 1395 = Pack² 278) and must have been known to the average readers of Demosthenes. The earliest published MS to contain a forged doc. is P.Oxy. XI 1377 = Pack² 284 (i ex. BC). Its early date invalidates the hypothesis of Koch (1909, 48) and others that the documents date from no sooner than the beginning of the Christian era. MSS of the Roman period are P.Haun. I 5 = Pack² 286, P.Oxy. XLII 3009 (both date from the second century AD, both supply docs. which are omitted by Med. MSS), P.Ant. I 27 =

structures of middle and low levels of style (§ 1.2). In the absence of reliable criteria of classification concerning these areas of language, the circularity of reasoning inherent in the comparative method exposes to an exceedingly marked danger of misjudgement any endeavour to undertake accurate assessments of individual occurrences of features supposedly belonging to the lower registers (cf. § 4.4).

3.4.4.1.3. The selection of authors and texts for comparison (§ 3.4.4.1.2) should respond to two different criteria. Firstly, the use of the feature under examination and of its variants (§ 3.4.4.1.1) must be investigated in sources akin to that in which the feature concerned occurs. Of course, the greater the affinity of parallels, the higher the probability that the comparison will yield reliable results. But in practice the requisite criteria of kinship vary according to circumstances, depending upon the nature and the difficulty of the question which the comparison is expected to answer. These include at least the period of composition and genre, but others, including religion and ethnicity,¹ may occasionally be necessary.²

Secondly, a range of dissimilar texts from that under examination must be investigated. The profit gained varies according to the degree of dissimilarity of the sources used for comparison. To define this, a distinction must be drawn between the date of composition and the other determinants of style selection, including genre. The uses of the specific feature under examination (and of its theoretical variants) should be investigated (1) in sources which are close in date but differ in genre and/or in other aspects; (2) in sources whose dates diverge significantly, but which are similar in other respects; (3) in dissimilar sources in terms of date, genre, and the like.

(1) allows one to set a linguistic and stylistic context for the analogies/differences found between usage in the text under examination and that in its parallel sources. It thereby enables the definition of the degree of significance of those analogies/differences with reasonable accuracy.³ A full disagreement with dissimilar sources versus a full agreement with close parallels will make this agreement significant for the characterisation of the variant(s) in question. Things change considerably if agreements with dissimilar texts are found. In such cases, agreements with similar

Pack² 280 (iii AD).

¹ Cf. for instance Ch. IV § 1.2.1 on the use of pleonastic λέγων introducing a quotation in P.Mil.Vogl. I 24.

² The methodological importance of selecting sources for comparison on the basis of criteria of similarity such as genre has generally been agreed upon. Wahlgren's recent objections (1995, 15) are unconvincing.

³ Synchronic linguistic variations have recently been studied by Wahlgren 1995 (cf. esp. p. 16).

sources become less significant, whereas disagreements with close parallels gain significance. This type of comparison appears the more necessary to investigations centred on papyri. As Greek literature of the Roman period to the fourth century AD includes no petitions and only a small number of letters, there are few — if any — opportunities to draw parallels between literary and non-literary texts belonging to one and the same genre before that century. Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that writers of papyrus letters and petitions could derive material from heterogeneous sources.

(2) allows one to compare usage in the text under discussion with the standard behaviour of like sources in earlier and possibly subsequent centuries. Admittedly, as the stylistic perception of variants was subject to changes through time because of the chronological developments of the different stylistic strata of the Greek language (cf. §§ 1.1, 4.3), there may be no correlation at all between the stylistic uses of one and the same feature in similar sources belonging to different periods of time. This may render such a comparison unnecessary or even misleading. But there is no good reason to take as given repeated flows of radical and pervasive transformations across the whole of the language system. This type of comparison can in fact be used with profit as a source of supplementary information, if precautions are taken to ensure against possible misconceptions when dealing with writings belonging to different periods. Furthermore, as the selection of language and style could be influenced *inter alia* by usage in previous literature (§ 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5), exploration of the past does in many cases help to assess the present.¹ Even later developments may in many respects shed light on previous periods.²

(3) serves a double purpose. First, it allows one to see whether a writer has derived material from heterogeneous sources of his past. Second, it provides contexts for (2); its function parallels that of (1) closely.

Unfortunately, numerous problems may hinder the utilisation of such a variety of sources, cf. §§ 3.4.4.1.3.1-3.4.4.1.3.3 below.

3.4.4.1.3.1. Many practical difficulties are generated by the current state of research on Koine Greek of the Roman and Byzantine periods. The information available on every aspect of the language and style of post-classical texts, with the exclusion of phonology and morphology, is generally insufficient to meet the demands

¹ Wahlgren's radical rejection of this methodological principle (1995, 16: 'die Vorgeschichte einer Konstruktion sollte, strikt genommen, nicht deren stilistische Bewertung beeinflussen') seems therefore unjustified.

² This accounts for the widespread use of Medieval and Modern Greek evidence to assess phenomena of Roman and early Byzantine Koine.

of the comparative method outlined above. To undertake a personal data collection is often a tiresome and time-consuming task.

(I) Many literary works, especially of the third century AD onwards, lack indexes, concordances, and lexica, and the general instrumenta are often inadequate for carrying out thorough linguistic research.¹ Searches through the TLG CD ROM (issued by the University of California) and the PHI CD ROM (issued by the Packard Humanities Institute at Los Angeles) supply a great deal of information on literary sources and the papyri respectively, but they can only provide rough data which then requires careful analysis. Moreover many authors, especially late antique and Byzantine, are not yet included in the TLG.

(II) There is no up-to-date comprehensive and detailed syntax of post-classical Greek.² One must refer to the best standard grammars of special classes of texts and periods,³ and to specific investigations. It has been observed, however, that most of these 'vary a great deal in aim, method, subject, and carefulness', and 'one can only use them with care and for restricted purposes'.⁴ I have tried to revise, check, and supplement them with my own investigation into second- to sixth-century papyrus letters and petitions, as well as sample literary texts of varying periods and genres.

(III). As regards word order and sentence structure, very few investigations

¹ Much information can be derived from some very good specific lexica (Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, Lampe, and, to a far lesser degree, LRG), but of course they are of limited value for investigating areas outside their own concern. Other instrumenta are of little help. LSJ + LSJ *RevSuppl*, TGL, and DGE are largely uninformative on Koine authors. The entries in Sophocles and the major lexica of Medieval Greek (Demetrakos, Du Cange, Kriaras, LBG) are generally very selective. WB I-II is out-of-date, and its supplements *WB Suppl. 1 & Suppl. 2* (which contain material from publications appeared up to 1976) are mere word-lists. For further problems cf. F. Montanari, in *Proc. 20th Int. Congr. Pap.* (Copenhagen 1994) 81-88 and H. Cadell, *ibid.* 94. On current trends in lexicographical research cf. Horsley 1994, 58-59.

² A few old comprehensive grammars (e.g. Jannaris 1897) may be helpful at times, but they are generally too selective for the demands of contemporary scholarship, and are based only on literary texts. There is no comprehensive syntax of the Roman and Byzantine non-literary papyri.

³ Cf. especially Mayser II 1-3 on Ptol. papyri (unfortunately out-of-date); Radermacher 1925, Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, and Turner, *Syntax* on the NT, papyri and other unpretentious Koine prose to about the early second century AD.

⁴ Hult 1990, 21. Strong criticisms of earlier investigations into post-classical prose were delivered by Frösén 1974.

centred upon sample authors and texts are available.¹ There is still a great deal to do before we can apply stylistic assessments to such matters. To avoid misleading and erroneous assertions, my attention in this thesis will thus focus only on specific aspects of great significance. Analyses will be carried out on the basis of my personal data collection.

(IV) Prose-rhythm also poses problems. Much research has been carried out on quantitative rhythmic prose,² but a variety of factors, including the occasional use of divergent methodological criteria, make it difficult to gain full profit from the available investigations. By contrast, research on accentual prose rhythm has recently been made easier by two excellent books,³ which provide not only sets of detailed data about prose writers of the mid-fourth century onwards, but also clear methods of describing and classifying rhythmic sequences.⁴ Notwithstanding recent progress, however, important issues have so far defied solution. The origin of accentual prose-

-
- ¹ So, for instance, Frisk's otherwise excellent book (1932) is based on a limited selection from Plutarch, the *NT*, Philostratus, and the papyri — of the numerous publications of papyri available at that time, Frisk used only the heterogeneous collection in *M.Chr.* Cf. also Horsley 1994, 69.
- ² Bibliographic lists will be found in St. Skimina, *État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose grecque*, I (*Bull. Int. de l' Acad. Polon. des Sciences et des Lettres. Classe de Philologie - Classe d' Histoire et de Philosophie* Suppl. 3, Krakow 1937) and Hörandner 1981, 12 (very selective).
- ³ Hörandner 1981; Klock 1987, 217-300. Bibliographies on accentual prose rhythm: St. Skimina, *État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose grecque*, II (*Eos* Suppl. 11, 1930); Hörandner 1981, 12-15; Klock 1987, 244-250 (on fourth-century writers only).
- ⁴ Hörandner 1981, 45-46 (cf. 35-36); Klock 1987, 230-232. Sensible remarks on the principles of analysis will also be found in other works. On the problem of how to detect tonic accents and word-boundaries cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hermes* 34 (1899) 216 n. 2 = *Kleine Schriften*, IV (Berlin 1962) 58 n. 1; Maas 1902, 505-506 (= Maas 1973, 427) and the many observations dispersed throughout the article (on the enclitics cf. also *ByzZ* 12 [1903] 319 ff. = Maas 1973, 283-285; *ByzZ* 17 [1908] 612 = Maas 1973, 458); Maas, *ByzZ* 19 (1910) 593; Hörandner 1981, 33-35; Klock 1987, esp. 227 (no. 1), 229, 298-300 (on the enclitics). For discussions of

rhythm is controversial,¹ and explorations into the development and typologies of the phenomenon before its full manifestations in the second half of the fourth century have been quite insufficient.²

3.4.4.1.3.2. Unfortunately, extant Koine texts are only a tiny minority of those that were produced in antiquity to be performed orally and/or circulate in written form. Only part of what individual writers once wrote has survived. The proportion becomes minimal if one also considers the presumably large number of non-literary papers which each educated individual must have written during his life-time. Overestimation of extant evidence may thus lead to misjudgements. It may be unwise, for instance, to stress the significance of the non-use of certain features in particular writers and periods of time. Secondly, as new publications of papyri continuously demonstrate, there is considerable danger of falling into error in taking the earliest occurrences of a word or mode of expression as valid indications of the time of its (re-) introduction into usage, let alone of the author who coined it or promoted its new life.³ Thirdly, the characterisation of individual features may be seriously affected, since it involves primarily judgements based on extant attestations; the thousands of papyri published in this century have led scholars to revise the assessment of a countless number of linguistic items, and the number of published occurrences of a word may be entirely a matter of chance.⁴ Finally, considering that the use (especially) of individual words, meanings, and modes of expression may have been inspired by specific passages in lost literary and 'non-literary' sources, accurate assessments may be illusory.⁵

3.4.4.1.3.3. Literary sources were available to ancient readers in manuscript copies more or less faithful to the original text. Alterations affecting the linguistic form may have led individuals to misjudge aspects of the language of a work or author. As the language of model authors and texts was regarded in antiquity as a guide to good

colon, period, and their boundaries in prose cf. also Fraenkel 1932 (= 1964, 73-92); Fraenkel 1933 (= 1964, 93-130); Fraenkel 1964, 131-139; Fraenkel 1965.

¹ Cf. Hörandner 1981, 37-42.

² Hörandner 1981, 37 (with bibliographic references), 44; cf. Klock 1987, 224. For data about the accentual prose rhythm in the second half of the fourth century cf. Klock 1987, 240 ff.

³ The same point has recently been raised by Dover 1997, 117 with reference to classical Greek.

⁴ For instance, I believe that the lexeme γράϊα was much more popular in Koine than its present four papyrus occurrences would suggest: cf. Ch. III § 2.1.3. Note also that its first attestation surfaced only in 1971 (P.Oxy. XXXVIII 2860.11)!

⁵ Cf. e.g. Ch. III § 2.1.2 on ἀκήρατος in SB III 7205.8.

usage (§ 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5), people who wished to follow the example of celebrated writers in drafting a prose text may occasionally have been deceived by erroneous readings in their own manuscripts of the imitated source or sources. Possible causes of deception include (a) adaptations of the Greek of classical Athenian texts to standard Koine; (b) banalisations of classicising Koine Greek to contemporary lower level Greek; (c) Atticistically-oriented 'improvements' on predominantly unpretentious and non-puristic Koine prose such as the LXX and the NT.¹

An example of (a) to cite but one. Phryn. *Ecl.* 231 Fischer testifies to a controversy between Phrynichus and the rhetor Cornelianus about whether a textually supposedly unobjectionable occurrence of βασιλίσσα in a passage of *Against Neaera* ([Dem.] 59.74) was to be regarded as a proof of puristic status for the word or not (cf. § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5).²

In fact, extant Medieval MSS of Demosthenes show βασιλίσσα to be a v.l. for βασιλιννα. Evidently both rhetors could avail themselves of manuscripts disfigured by a wrong reading, and on that wrong reading they based their own linguistic judgements. For further cases drawn from Atticist lexicography see Tosi 1988, 182-186.

It must be admitted, however, that cases of the misleading influence of manuscript variants on competence and performance are generally very difficult to detect, let alone to prove. This is true even of those readings whose model can be identified with certainty.

An illustrative example. P.Oxy. XLV 3235 (iii AD), a fragmentary autograph (? ³) declamation which imitates Demosthenes' *Olynthiacs*, displays (i) ἄχρις for ἄχρη (fr. 2 ii 12), (ii) ἐαυτοῖς for ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς (fr. 1 i 4). (i) deviates from the supposedly original Demosthenic text ⁴ and infringes the rules of Atticism (*Philet.* 69 Dain; Phryn. *Ecl.* 6 Fischer; Moer. 189.7 Bekker). (ii), though occasionally found in Attic prose (with a more or less solid MS basis), is limited, in the Demosthenic corpus, to non-Demosthenic texts

¹ On the (inconsistent) Atticist improvements of the Lucianic manuscripts on LXX Greek see Rahlfs 1911; J. Ziegler, *Analecta Biblica* 10 (1959) 76-95; Brock 1966, 229-307, as well as the introductions to the Göttingen editions of *Jeremiah*, *Baruch*, *Epistle of Jeremiah* (vol. XV, 1976², 91-92), *Ezekiel* (vol. XVI (1), 1977², 55-56), *Job* (vol. XI (4), 1982, 120), *Isaiah* (vol. XIV, 1983³, 87), *Twelve prophets* (vol. XIII, 1984³, 88), *2 Maccabees* (vol. IX (2), 1976², 22), *3 Maccabees* (vol. IX, 1980², 21), and *Esther* (vol. VIII (3), 1983², 89) (the former five vols. are by J. Ziegler, the others by R. Hanhart). On Atticism's influence on the Greek of NT manuscripts see Michaelis 1923, Kilpatrick 1963, Elliott 1972, Elliott 1976, and the references cited by Voelz 1984, 937 n. 259; for a recent appraisal of scholarship cf. Horsley 1989, 42-44. On the significance of scribal corrections for the linguist cf. Frösén 1974, 194.

² *Philet.* 121 Dain also knows of an attestation of βασιλίσσα in *Against Neaera*. Sonia Argyle, who has recently argued for Cornelianus' authorship of *Philetaerus* (Argyle 1989), has taken *Philet.* 121 as Cornelianus' very stand-point to which Phrynichus replied in *Ecl.* 231 (pp. 526, 533-534). (The first part of *Ecl.* 231, instead, seems a response to Antiatt. 84.26-27 Bekker, cf. Latte 1915, 380 [= 1968, 618]; Fischer 1974, 40, 41 n. 10.)

³ So the editor (M. Haslam), cf. *P.Oxy.* XLV (1977) p. 68.

⁴ ἄχρη occurs 17x in the Demosthenic corpus (never in the *Olynthiacs*). On Attic literary usage in

(Kühner-Gerth I 572; Koch 1909, 13). In spite of its classical attestations and of its use in more or less strongly Atticising writers and declaimers (cf. App. (B) § 1.8 B no. 2), it was condemned as a solecism by Luc. *Soloec.* 4.¹ It seems that the writer of P.Oxy. 3235 found both usages wholly acceptable, because unlike other passages in the same declamation, neither reading was improved linguistically. As the editor pointed out (P.Oxy. XLV [1977] p. 73, comm. on (i)), the writer may well have been deceived by faulty readings in his manuscript of Demosthenes. But he may also have been misled while re-phrasing Demosthenes, under the influence either of standard Koine or possibly of mild Atticism (this is true of (ii), anyway, cf. § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5).

The virtual impossibility of testing the real effect of manuscript variant readings of model authors upon individual linguistic choices is yet another demonstration of how great the danger of error and inaccuracy is (or may be) in stylistic assessments of language.

3.4.4.2. Non-literary papyri in both draft and finished copy form often display alterations made to the original text by the composers themselves.² Those entered within the line of writing, and occasionally also the supralinear emendations (cf. Ch. III § 1.2.1.2.4), point to immediate dissatisfaction with the chosen word or portion of word, whereas those added in the interlinear and lateral margins seem to presuppose a re-examination of either the whole text or a long pericope. They supply useful evidence of planned composition. The large majority of corrections aim either to emend errors and inaccuracies which may have crept in unnoticed, or to make the sense more intelligible, or to add details relevant to subject-matter. Occasionally, they are intended to refine the style. Such corrections are methodologically very important for the linguist.³ First, they allow one to assess individual choices on objective grounds, since they enable the determination of the stylistic judgement of a writer on an individual feature versus that of a variant of it in a specific situation. Second, they point to stylistic awareness⁴ and developed competence, although they cannot allow the actual range of the writer's repertoire to be defined outside the specific point affected by the correction. To some extent, this contributes to the evaluation of the same writer's performance in other passages of the text under discussion and possibly in other texts. Some significant examples will suffice.⁵

general cf. e.g. Schwyzer I 405; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v.

¹ For refs. to the ancient debate about its grammatical correctness cf. App. (B) § 1.8 B no. 2.

² On the criteria of identification of hands, and their problems, see § 3.3.1 above.

³ Cf. Ševčenko 1981a, 289, 294-295 (on evidence of stylistic revision in Byzantine literature).

⁴ Cf. Ševčenko 1981a, 292.

⁵ For further examples see Ch. III § 1.2.1.2.4.

Chapter One

1. In the draft petition P.Col. X 266 (AD 179-181), the writer changed an inceptive καί into καὶ . . . δέ by adding δέ above the line (l. 13). The correction seems to serve a double stylistic purpose: (a) it stresses a particular nuance, since δέ emphasises distinction between the new sentence and the preceding one ('and, on the other hand', 'und andererseits', cf. *GP*² 199 with n. 1); (b) it suggests discontent with lower level Greek, which made frequent use of καί to introduce a new sentence. Evidently the writer regarded this usage as less expressive than καὶ . . . δέ (cf. ll. 9-10 καὶ . . . τοίνυν). This combination of particles is classical (Kühner-Gerth II 253; *GP*² 200 ff.), but it is also found in Koine Greek of different stylistic registers, including unpretentious prose (Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. δέ 4b). The present case suggests that the use of καὶ . . . δέ in predominantly unsophisticated writings represents a marker of distinction from vulgar Greek.

2. The second-century private letters P.Oxy. I 113.27 and 115.4 display supralinear additions of the article by the senders themselves.¹ In neither case would the omissions have been a serious grammatical offence, but evidently the original texts were considered inelegant enough to deserve correction.²

3. At least one of the many first-hand corrections entered in the draft petition BGU XI 2012 (*mid ii AD*) depends on concern for style. At ll. 7-8, the writer changed ἡγεμὼν κύριε ἐνέτυχόν σοι διὰ βιβλιδίου into ἐνέτυχόν σοι, ἡγεμὼν κύριε, διὰ βιβλιδίου by deleting the initial ἡγεμὼν κύριε and re-writing it *supra lineam* after σοι. The vocative was thus transposed from its original position at the head of the clause to a position after the 2nd person pronoun. Both positions were used by Koine prose writers to obtain different stylistic effects.³ In BGU 2012, the writer probably introduced the change to emphasise the fact that he had already petitioned the same prefect.

4. Among the many textual alterations exhibited by the draft letter P.Oxy. XLVII 3366.17-39 (= P.Coll.Youtie II 66.17-39; repr. in part as *New Docs.* I 26 p. 73 f.) (text B) (AD 253-260, possibly 258 or 259⁴), the following have a bearing on language and style:

— substitution of an aor. ind. (ἡξάμην) with an impf. (ἡχόμην) (l. 21): both the context and the reason for the correction are uncertain;

¹ In each letter, one and the same hand (a) wrote the main body of the letter, (b) added the farewell formula, (c) made the alterations.

² Cf. F. Eakin, *AJPh* 37 (1916) 334-335.

³ Cf. e.g. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 474,6 on the NT.

⁴ Cf. Parsons 1976, 419; W.H.M. Liesker in *Proc. XVIII Int. Congr. of Pap.*, II (Athens 1988) 460 with n. 23.

- substitution (l. 25) of the aor. subj. (πέμψης) with the pres. subj. (πέμπης) in a conditional clause with εἰάν combined with an apodosis in the fut. (l. 24). Grammatically, the aor. subj. is precisely the tense one would expect in such circumstances.¹ Evidently the writer altered the text to emphasise a particular nuance; which exactly it is hard to tell;²
- substitution of ἵνα + subj. with the inf. after συμβάλλομαι 'be of help' (l. 31), probably to avoid a 'modern' construction;³
- substitution of καὶ γὰρ καί at the head of a clause with δέ (l. 26);
- substitution of ἐπιστέλλων with γράφων (l. 24) probably to obviate a harsh repetition (ἐπι[στέλλω] and ἐπιστολ(ήν) precede at l. 23);
- deletion of εἰσιν (l. 34) to obviate a harsh repetition of the same word in the same period and line.

5. In the letter P.Got. 12.4 (late iii/early iv AD), ἵνα was deleted and replaced with ὅπως *supra lineam*. Grammatically, ὅπως and ἵνα are equivalent, but the writer undoubtedly considered the former stylistically superior.⁴

6. The private letter P.Oxy. VII 1070 (= Tibiletti 1979 no. 16) (late iii AD) exhibits two instances of stylistic correction by the sender himself. At l. 3, τε was added above the line with a view to changing a connective καί between words into a τε . . . καί

-
- ¹ If followed by a fut. in the main clause, the aor. subj. seems to denote in a large number of cases 'a definite event as occurring only once in the future, and conceived as taking place before the time of the action of the main verb' (Turner, *Syntax* 113; cf. Mayser II 1, pp. 275-276 and 279-280; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 373,3). This is precisely the type of event denoted by the present passage.
- ² The pres. subj. has been viewed as denoting a futuristic action when it is used in connection with a fut. in the main clause (Mayser II 1, p. 276, followed by Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 373,3). But why an individual should have deliberately preferred it to the aor., although this was standard in such circumstances, I cannot tell. Occasional occurrences of the pres. and aor. subj. as *vv.ll.* for each other in texts subject to a manuscript transmission (cf. *NT Lc.* 13.5; *Io.* 14.14; *I Co.* 9.16; *Ia.* 4.15) are hard to interpret and provide no secure answer to the issue.
- ³ ἵνα after συμβάλλομαι (unclass.) may have originated from class. πρὸς + articular inf. (cf. Isocr. *Areop.* 21). The inf. may have been chosen to obtain an old-fashioned flavour (ἵνα developed considerably in post-class. Greek at the expense of the infinitive, cf. e.g. § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5 II).
- ⁴ See the editor's comm. *ad loc.* On ὅπως / ἵνα in post-class. unpretentious prose cf. Mayser II 1, 247-252, 256, 257, 261; Schwyzler II 673; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 369,4 (with further bibl.);

structure, and thereby to providing a closer link between the two words.¹ At ll. 15-16, the writer deleted the co-ordinating particle δέ and replaced it with οὐχ ἥττον δὲ καί at the head of the clause. For a discussion of both corrections see Ch. IV § 1.1.1.

7. In the early fourth-century letter SB XII 10803.13 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 12), the original reading ἤξει was corrected to ἐλεύσεται above the line, presumably for the sake of variation (Ch. IV § 1.1.3.4.1).

An analysis of variants through this type of corrections may thus yield results which corroborate the general characterisation of those same variants as can be inferred from a comparison with earlier and contemporary sources. But it may also produce unexpected results. The above selection includes at least one instance of surprising alteration evidently caused by indeterminable individual stylistic preferences.² In other cases (no. 2), the very existence of a stylistically significant difference between the two usages, let alone individual awareness of that difference, could hardly have been detected and proved had they not been presented as variants by the writers. This shows that stylistic motivations may escape detection, no matter how scrupulous the investigation.

Turner, *Syntax* 106. Cf. also Horsley 1994, 64.

¹ The alteration is not recorded in the edd. On the different stylistic function of τε . . . καί from simple καί in post-class. Greek see Mayser II 3, p. 159 ff.; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 444,1; Turner, *Syntax* 339; cf. also Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. τε 3. On τε . . . καί in class. cf. e.g. Kühner-Gerth II 249 ff.; *GP*² 511-513, 515.

² Cf. πέμψης / πέμπης in no. 4.

4. PROBLEMS OF TERMINOLOGY

4.1. KOINE

Nowadays the term 'Koine' is used in a disconcerting variety of meanings.¹ A survey of the available definitions would in many respects provide insights into the history of scholarship concerning the Greek language after Alexander the Great. It must be emphasised, however, that 'Koine' is a mere label whose relationship to any of the realms of language for which it has been believed to stand is not dictated by necessity, but arbitrary. No clue to a firm meaning can be derived from the fluctuating usage of *κοινή* in ancient sources.² There is no reason, then, to regard one or other of the proposed definitions of Koine as 'more correct' than others.³ I have selected mine among the many available on the basis of criteria such as clarity and flexibility. 'Koine' is thus used in this thesis to designate all Greek from about the late fourth / early third century BC through to approximately the sixth / seventh century AD.⁴ Diachronic and synchronic distinctions within the chosen period of Koine will be signalled explicitly; I shall regard Atticism as a movement within the period of Koine and Atticising orientations as features of higher registers within the stylistic spectrum of Koine.

Periodisations are of course oversimplifications of reality. My chosen time-boundaries for Koine are therefore arbitrary. Its beginning has been established by convention, while its end corresponds to the approximate time determined by a few linguists of international repute as the beginning of Medieval Greek.⁵ The additional notion of 'Byzantine Greek' is difficult to define not only in relation to 'Koine' and

¹ Cf. most recently the observations of Horsley 1989, 41; Brixhe-Hodot 1993, 8; Swain 1996, 19. For the (rather occasional) usage of the word in modern sociolinguistics cf. Bubeník 1989, 8-9.

² On the meanings of *κοινή* and related words in antiquity cf. A. Giese, *Über den aeolischen Dialekt* (Berlin 1837) 47-49; A.N. Jannaris, *CR* 17 (1903) 93-96; Maidhof 1912, 5-91; Hedberg 1935; Versteegh 1986, 256-269; A. Morpurgo Davies, *Verbum* 10 (1987) 14, 24-25 n. 21-23; Consani 1991. Cf. also Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 6; A.C. Cassio, in E. Crespo *et al.* (edd.), *Dialectologia Graeca. Actas II Col. Int. de Dialectología Griega* (Madrid 1993) 86-88.

³ Two examples of this attitude: Kapsomenos 1953, 249; Brixhe-Hodot 1993, 20. Their proposals for a 'correct' use of the term Koine (Kapsomenos says 'richtig', Brixhe-Hodot 'réellement') go precisely in the opposite direction!

⁴ My chosen definition of Koine has in recent years been adopted by Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 8; Frösén 1974 (esp. 10-11, 49-50, 95-133); Gil 1987, 83; Horsley 1989, 41.

⁵ Cf. e.g. Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 9; Browning 1983.

'Medieval Greek', but also because of a possible confusion with the uses of the term 'Byzantine' in history (p. 21 n. 1). With a view to emphasising the linguistic continuity between periods marked by arbitrary time-boundaries, I use the term 'Byzantine Greek' to designate the period of the Greek language which overlaps late Koine and the Greek of the early Middle Ages.

4.2. A NOTE ON ABSTRACT TERMS

Abstract terms such as purism, classicism, Atticism and the like are generally used in classical scholarship to denote (a) specific linguistic features, (b) the language use of individual writers, (c) general linguistic and stylistic trends. In spite of a recent accusation of vagueness,¹ I regard this convention as not only acceptable but indeed absolutely correct and serviceable. Recent research in modern linguistics provides the foundations of that apparent fluctuation. George Thomas, for example, has shown in his excellent book on purism

- (i) that no aspect and level of language (in terms of phonology, orthography, morphology, syntax, vocabulary, and phraseology) is in principle exempt from the impact of puristic intervention, and that any element of language may be targeted for puristic removal or acceptance.² The use of 'purism' and 'puristic' with reference to a specific linguistic feature is therefore justified, since it allows the detection of a target of puristic concern;
- (ii) that inasmuch as purism is an attitude towards language, it involves a variety of individual and societal responses in terms of degrees of intensity of puristic acceptance.³ 'Puristic' can thus be used in relation to the general linguistic profile of a writer or of a literary movement.⁴

The same is true of any manifestation of language cultivation. Abstract terms thus allow us to define the attitudes which shape language use at all levels; the possible resulting fluctuation is not evidence of a lack of terminological accuracy and consistency.⁵

¹ Wahlgren 1995, 14.

² Thomas 1991, esp. 62-75, 86 ff.

³ Thomas 1991: see especially his description of puristic profiles at p. 170 ff.

⁴ On purism and literary movements cf. Thomas 1991, 141-145.

⁵ Incidentally, it is significant that Thomas has shown no concern about the fluctuation inherent in the use of the term 'purism'.

4.3. WRITTEN AND SPOKEN KOINE

In recent years, scholars of the ancient Greek language have shown growing awareness of the need for a clear distinction between written and spoken language and for a delimitation of the use of written records as evidence for the living speech.¹ As regards post-classical Greek, this issue is certainly of much consequence for the study of phonology, but the purpose of this thesis is to investigate modes of expression and stylistic strategies in written texts (§ 1.2). To what extent the results obtained may be regarded as illustrative of the possible diachronic and synchronic changes in spoken language, is thus immaterial. As a rule, I shall keep the two spheres of language distinct; sources used for comparison (§ 3.4.4.1.3) will be treated as written documents, the language of which is the result of choices made primarily with a view to writing. Nevertheless, questions of language use in speech will have to be addressed occasionally, especially if the text or passage under examination is meant as a registration of oral communication.²

4.4. STANDARD AND COLLOQUIAL KOINE

4.4.0. One of the basic problems in discussing levels of style and related matters in post-classical Greek (and in ancient Greek in general) is that scholars generally fail to define their own usage of such fundamental terms as 'colloquial', 'vulgar', *Umgangssprache*, and the like. As a result, it is often unclear what exactly they mean when they use those labels. Furthermore, notwithstanding the efforts to illustrate individual aspects of unpretentious Koine Greek, little or no attempt has been made to produce careful and evidence-based descriptions of the multifaceted nature of standard language and its relationship with substandard and colloquial language in diachronic and synchronic perspective.³ As a consequence, individual uses of features

¹ See esp. Rydbeck 1967, 115, 195-196; Frösén 1974; Kaimio 1979, 18; F.R. Adrados, *Revista Española de Lingüística* 11 (1981) 312-313; Versteegh 1986, 254-255, 269; Bubeník 1989, 23-27; Brixhe 1990, 44-46; S.R. Slings, *CPH* 87 (1992) 95-109; Brixhe-Hodot 1993, 12 ff. Cf. already Costas 1933, 52 n. 1, 48, 80, 92, and also Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 8; Hult 1990, 23.

² Cf. e.g. § 4.4.2 below.

³ For (predominantly theoretical) discussions of some of these notions with special reference to post-classical Greek cf. Frösén 1974; Versteegh 1986, 251 ff.; K. Versteegh, 'Koine-Grieks en vulgair Latijn. De verhouding tussen standaardtaal en volkstaal', *Lampas* 22 (1989) 74-91; J. Kramer, 'Klassische Sprache und Substandard in der Geschichte der Griechischen', in G. Holtus - E. Radtke (edd.), *Sprachlicher Substandard*, II (Tübingen 1989) 55-82. On the current state of research on levels of style cf. § 1.1.

Chapter One

characteristic of unpretentious prose may be hard to assess in detail (cf. §§ 3.4.4.1.2 no. 6; 4.4.2). In what follows, I shall define my own usage of the terms 'standard', 'colloquial', 'vulgar', and shall dedicate a few words on my chosen criteria of distinction between the realms of language which those terms are meant to denote.

4.4.1. 'Standard'. The term 'norm' may indicate a model to be imitated or a pattern of frequency. The former is prescriptive in nature; such a norm was identified with classical Attic throughout all Koine periods, particularly from the second century AD onwards (§ 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5). The latter is primarily descriptive. I shall always reserve the term 'standard' for this category. My chosen criterion of what is standard is thus the frequency of occurrence in a given context, be it an author, a speech community, a particular time, a register, a technical language, and so forth. In principle, no normative value was attached to any standard Koine feature in the Roman period, unless it had been used to a greater or lesser extent in classical Greek.¹ But in fact the relationship between norms of good usage and language standardisation is a much more complex issue.² A full discussion of this question with reference to ancient Greek falls outside the scope of the present thesis, but aspects of it will be dealt with occasionally.

4.4.2. 'Colloquial' and 'vulgar'. In this thesis, the term 'vulgar' is reserved for *markedly inelegant language uses and features belonging to the lowest register of style*. By contrast, the term 'colloquial' is used to denote items which approach informal speech closely, and also specific features characteristic of, yet not necessarily confined to, that mode of expression. The notion of colloquial language may overlap a variety of levels within the broad stylistic spectrum of unsophisticated speech. Considering the possibility that people had varying degrees of linguistic competence, even relaxed and casual oral performance is likely to have varied according to individuals: some may have had a less graceless and less unpolished utterance than others. I shall thus use the term 'colloquial' not as an indicator of stylistic level, but with a view to emphasising the high degree of informality inherent in the use of language.

But how can we tell that a written performance reflects informal utterance?

Multi-lingual conversational manuals were used in late antiquity, and in late antique Egypt in particular, to learn the *sermo cottidianus* (or ὁμιλία καθημερινή) of foreign languages.³ Their Greek can be taken as a specimen of colloquial language, although the

¹ On the problem cf. § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5.

² For a recent discussion of the problem cf. G. Thomas 1991, 12, 115-122, 134.

³ Cf. (i) the *Colloquia* published in *CGL* III (refs. in Dionisotti 1988, 27) and by Dionisotti 1982, 97 ff.; (ii) the trilingual manual P.Berol. inv. 10582 (CPL 281 = GB 15 = M. Hasitzka, *Neue Texte und Dokumentation zum Koptisch-Unterricht* [MPER N.S. 18, Vienna 1990] no. 270; on the text cf. also W. Brunsch, *APF* 31 [1985] 43-45), assigned to the

evidence supplied by texts which were not composed by native Greeks¹ is to be handled with caution. But in consideration of the possible differences between written and spoken language (§ 4.3), judgements of colloquiality can only be applied to prose to a limited extent. In this connection, a distinction must be drawn between (a) language uses and (b) specific features.

(a). The language and style of an unpretentious papyrus letter or petition should not be equated to informal conversation, unless coherent evidence points in that direction, since 'it is probable that some degree of unconscious self-censoring purism is universal and that any attempt at writing involves some form of conscious self-censorship (though not necessarily puristically motivated).'² A combination of a high degree of spontaneity in thought and phraseology and a repeated use of stylistic phenomena characteristic of informal speech (cf. (b) below) is a fairly reliable criterion for establishing colloquiality. On these premises, P.Oxy. I 119 (ii or iii AD), a letter from a boy to his father, can no doubt be regarded as an excellent example of a colloquial letter.³ But where evidence is not so coherent, the term 'colloquial' may be inappropriate. In such cases, I prefer avoiding this label and resorting to less compromising terminology.

(b). The informal nature, and indeed the frequent occurrence in the living speech, of certain stylistic phenomena which relate to sentence structure, such as e.g. parataxis, anacoluthon, asyndeton, is advocated not only by intensive investigations into Greek and Latin prose and rhetoric, but also by comparative stylistics and linguistics. By contrast, morphological and syntactical features could be described as colloquial

fifth/sixth century AD (on the manual cf. also B. Baldwin, *Glotta* 60 [1982] 79-81; L.S.B. MacCoull, *Glotta* 64 [1986] 253-257). Circulation of such manuals in Egypt: P.Berol. inv. 10582, P.Prag. II 118 (a fifth-century fragment of *Colloquium Harleianum* [CGL III 108-116]). Cf. J. Kramer 1996, 36-37. Self-conscious description of their language as *sermo cottidianus* ~ ὁμιλία καθημερινή: e.g. Dionisotti 1982, 97 (1); GB 15.42-43. Cf. also Dionisotti 1982 & 1988, 26-31.

¹ This seems to be the case of P.Berol. inv. 10582, cf. e.g. GB p. 97, Wouters 1988, 105. In other manuals, the Greek version was the original one, cf. J. Kramer 1991, 37. Recognition of their language as colloquial Greek: e.g. Maidhof 1912, 297 ff.; Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 19; Dionisotti 1982, 91, 95-96 (with detailed linguistic observations); Dionisotti 1988, 29; Brixhe-Hodot 1993, 10. Textual variations between P.Prag. 118 and the Med. MSS have been regarded as evidence of the development of colloquial Greek in the course of centuries (J. Kramer 1996, 37; but the view has not been repeated at P.Prag. II p. 5 [comm. on no. 118.5]). In general, on the educational methods of *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* see esp. Dionisotti 1982, 90 ff.; cf. also J. Debut, *Koinonia* 8 (1984) 61-85; Dionisotti 1988, 28 ff.

² G. Thomas 1991, 115 (cf. 90, 131-132).

³ Deissmann 1923 no. 14; Hengstl 1978 no. 82. On the language see esp. Fr. Blass, *Hermes*

Chapter One

only by means of a comparative analysis of frequencies in a variety of texts (cf. § 3.4.4.1.2(2)). But the reliability of such judgements is affected by the uncertainties produced by the circularity of reasoning inherent in the method (§ 3.4.4.1.2) and the difficulty in distinguishing a colloquial text from a non-colloquial, yet still unpretentious, piece of writing (see (a) above).

34 (1899) 313-315; Salenius 1927, 34-35; P. Murlon Beernaert, *EtClass* 30 (1962) 315-317; E. Sabbadini, *StudPap* 6 (1967) 85-94; Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 13. On the hand cf. p. 36 n. 3.

CHAPTER TWO

ACQUIRING A BACKGROUND IN GRAMMAR AND RHETORIC IN ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EGYPT

1. THE PLACE OF CLASSICAL GREEK IN THE GRAMMATICAL EDUCATION OF PUPILS IN ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EGYPT

1.1. This section takes as its basis the conviction that language competence is a major determinant of written performance (Ch. I § 3.4.3). It will concentrate on linguistic education as a fundamental prerequisite of competence and as a necessary step to good performance. According to Quintilian, grammar is a *recte loquendi scientia*: the grammarian must cultivate *inter alia* the rules for correct speech in order to prepare students to speak correctly.¹ I shall thus examine the specific orientation of the teaching of Greek grammar in Roman and Byzantine Egypt as illustrative of the kind of linguistic schooling presumably received by well-educated people during their years of study.² My attention will focus on morphology, for which there is abundant manuscript evidence.

1.2. In the Roman and Byzantine periods, morphology was taught by means of declension and conjugation tables which were compiled on the basis of theoretical rules for the nominal and verbal inflections (εἰσαγωγικοὶ κανόνες).³ The most famous example of a conjugation table is the *Tabula* composed on the basis of *Εἰσαγωγικοὶ κανόνες περὶ κλίσεως ῥημάτων* (ed. Hilgard, *Gramm. Gr.* IV 1, pp. 43-99) of the Alexandrian grammarian Theodosius (late ii AD - late v AD⁴), and transmitted by Medieval manuscripts as an appendix to (Pseudo-)Dionysius Thrax's *Τέχνη γραμματική* (ed. Uhlig, *Gramm. Gr.* I 1, pp. 125-132).⁵ But morphological lists are also preserved by

¹ Cf. especially Quintil. *Inst. or.* 1.4.2, 1.5.1. On correctness of speech in the ancient grammatical science see esp. Siebenborn 1976, 32 ff.

² In general, on the teaching of grammar in antiquity see Hovdhaugen 1991.

³ Cf. Quintil. *Inst. or.* 1.4.22 *nomina declinare et verba in primis pueri sciunt*. On the meaning of the word κανών see Siebenborn 1976, 67; Wouters 1988, 78 n. 62 (with further bibliography).

⁴ On his date and writings see Wouters 1988, 30 n. 33; Kaster 1988, 366-367 no. 152. On the problem of Greek grammatical systematisation of inflection before Theodosius' *Canons* see D. Fehling, *Glotta* 35 (1956) 214-270; Siebenborn 1976, 75-78; Erbse 1980, 237-244; Schenkeveld 1994, 287.

⁵ The debate about the authenticity of *Τέχνη γραμματική* § 6 ff. is on-going. Major contributions against it: V. Di Benedetto, *ASNP* s. ii, 27 (1958-1959) 169-210; s. ii, 28 (1958-1959) 87-118; s. iii, 3 (1973) 797-814; *Glotta* 68 (1990) 19-39. Contrast e.g. Erbse 1980. For a general history of the debate since 1958/59 see A. Kemp, in P. Schmitter (ed.), *Sprachtheorien der abendländischen Antike* (Tübingen 1991) 307-315. Most recent discussions of the issue (or of topics relevant to it): V. Law, in H.J. Niederehe - K. Koerner (edd.), *History and Historiography of Linguistics* (Amsterdam 1990) 89-96;

Chapter Two

several papyri and tablets datable on palaeographical grounds to the late first to late seventh/early eighth centuries.¹ As some of these are certainly earlier than Theodosius, and some items differ from the *Tabula* in some respects, it is evident that the *Tabula* was neither the first nor the only recognised work of its kind.² Unfortunately, it is not absolutely certain that all the extant papyrus tables are actual school-texts, since there is no telling whether professionally-produced manuscripts were prepared for school use or for non-educational purposes.³ I shall treat papyri of doubtful educational character with due caution.

Another issue relevant to my discussion below is how to distinguish whether a grammatical school-text is a pupil's exercise or a teacher's model. Unsurprisingly, scholarly opinions often diverge, see Weems 1981; Wouters 1988, 34; Cribiore 1996. The criteria of assessment have most recently been re-examined by Cribiore, but my personal judgements sometimes differ from hers. In general, I am less inclined to consider practised hands of the kind termed 'rapid' by Cribiore to have derive from the pen of pupils; she herself recognises that they may equally belong to teachers.⁴ I regard the handwriting of the very advanced student who penned the letter P.Oxy. XVIII 2190 (see p. 71 n. 2) as illustrative of the average graphic skill of mature pupils. The top half of col. i and the first three lines of col. ii show that this boy was able to use fairly competent, regular capitals resembling literary hands (cf. *GMAW*² p. 152 n. 148), although roughness and irregularity in execution increase under relaxation and haste (cf. the lower half of col. ii). Considering that students who attended the grammarian's lessons were less advanced than he was, I do not expect a pupil's inflectional table to display such practised script. I thus regard the late third- / early fourth-century conjugation tables T.Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 7a (ed. Parsons 1970, 145) and P.Col. VIII 206 as manuscripts illustrating the degree of graphic skill acquired by pupils who attended the grammarian's class.⁵ Unlike Cribiore, I also incline to admit that a

Schenkeveld 1994, 266 ff.; P. Swiggers - A. Wouters, *Orbis* 37 (1994) 521-549; V. Law - I. Sluiter (edd.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē* (Münster 1995) esp. 13-26 (R.H. Robins), 27-39 (J. Lallot), 41-53 (D.M. Schenkeveld), 95-109 (A. Wouters), 111-119 (V. Law), 151-152 (V. Di Benedetto).

- ¹ For a chronologically-ordered list of conjugation tables see Wouters 1988, 33-34; add P.Col. VIII 206 (iii/iv AD) and P.Chester Beatty AC 1499 (ed. Wouters 1988). Cf. also *P.Col.* VIII (1990) pp. 64-65.
- ² Cf. B. Snell, *P.Hamb.* II (1954) p. 116 n. 1; Oguse 1957, 86-88; Wouters 1988, 79-80.
- ³ For a recent list of inflectional tables prepared for school use see Cribiore 1997, 57, which is based on her revised catalogue of school-texts (Cribiore 1996, 175-284). Tables excluded from that list because of their 'questionable' or 'indistinguishable' educational character will be found in Cribiore 1996, 286-287. Other scholars have accepted more items as possible school-texts (cf. Weems 1981; Wouters 1988, 33-34). For detailed information on scholars' viewpoints on individual papyri see § 1.3.1 below.
- ⁴ See Cribiore 1996, 112.
- ⁵ For the hypothesis that T.Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 7a represents a pupil's copy see § 1.3.1, where further bibliography on the Oxford tablets and the Columbia papyrus

teacher could commit errors, even of grammatical nature,¹ since we know that the professional competence of teachers was subject to inequalities, and that they could be selected, employed, and dismissed on account of their (in)competence.²

1.3. Historians of education, linguists, and students of post-classical Greek civilisation and literature have often emphasised the archaising character of Greek grammatical schooling.³ Papyri and tablets excavated in Egypt largely confirm that pupils were taught (or were expected to be taught) classical morphology, and not the inflectional characteristics of the living speech.⁴ To illustrate this in detail, it will suffice to consider a number of significant features of classical Greek which persist in school curriculums in spite of their disappearance both from contemporary written informal usage and from living speech.

1.3.1. The dual was foreign to casual utterance in the period of Koine; its use in literary and non-literary prose is always a mark of puristic pretension (Ch. III § 1.2.2). Yet it was certainly taught in schools. Declensions displaying dual forms are preserved by two late fifth- / early sixth-century Antinoopolis papyrus codices, both of which seem by general consent to have been used for classroom instruction:

— PSI inv. 479;⁵ dual forms occur in the declensions of σοφός (verso, ll. 8-10, 23-25, 38-40), Πρίαμος, and Ἐκάβη (recto, ll. 44-46 and 59-61, respectively);

will be found.

- ¹ I wholly agree with the sensible remarks of Weems 1981, 90-91.
- ² Cf. P.Oxy. XVIII 2190 (i AD), a letter from a student in quest of a suitable καθηγητής. The papyrus has recently been revised by Rea 1993; cf. also Cribiore 1996, 167 nos. 1-5. It may be noted that professional competence of teachers was not subject to formal training and official certification in the Graeco-Roman world. 'For private teachers, what mattered was the word of mouth passed by fathers willing to send their sons to one's school or by patrons suggesting they should' (Kaster 1988, 35, 207-209 [the quotation is taken from p. 208]; cf. Hovdhaugen 1991, 380). And in judging the professional qualifications of a teacher, greater emphasis was put on ethical qualities than on skills (Kaster 1988, 64-66, 210-211). 'The grammarian's knowledge was not different in kind - or even necessarily in quantity - from that of any well-bred *litteratus*' (Kaster 1988, 205).
- ³ Cf. e.g. Marrou 1965, 301, 404; Bowie 1970, 4; Browning 1983, 69 ('it [the archaising literary tongue] was the only kind of Greek taught in schools').
- ⁴ Cf. Radermacher 1947, 56; Wouters 1988, 80-81; Morgan 1995, 79-80.
- ⁵ Ed. Zalateo 1940, 12-14. Pack² 2706. School use: Weems 1981, 31-32, 92, 265; Debut no. 327; Cribiore 1996, 267 no. 372.

Chapter Two

- PSI inv. 2052:¹ dual forms occur in the declensions of παῖς (recto, ll. 7-9) and καλός (verso, ll. 17-19).

These manuscripts supply educational parallels for the presence of dual forms in declensions of nouns and names in Theodosius' *Canons* (Theod. *Εἰσαγωγ. κανόν. περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομ.*, ed. Hilgard, *Gramm. Gr.* IV 1, p. 3 ff.). As regards the verbal inflection, dual forms are used throughout in the *Tabula* and have survived in the following papyri:

ii AD:

- P.Vindob. G 29815 B ² (Fayum): dual forms of various tenses of the imperative middle of τύπτω (ll. 1-5);
- P.Stras. inv. 364+16:³ dual forms of the aor. ind. middle (col. i 6-8), the fut. perfect (col. i 34-36), and of various tenses of the imperative (col. ii) of φωνέω;

iii AD:

- PSI inv. 204 ⁴ (Oxy.): dual forms of the perf., plupf., aor., fut. indicative active (recto), and of the pres., impf., perf., plupf. indicative middle (verso) of γράφω;

late iii AD:

- London, BL, Add. MS 37516 verso:⁵ conjugation of νικάω displaying dual forms of all tenses of the optative and the participle active and middle;
 - T. Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 7a:⁶ conjugation of ποιέω displaying dual forms of the pres., impf., perf., plupf., aor., fut. indicative active;
- Both tablets may come from one and the same classroom (see p. 75) in the Oasis Maior (Parsons 1970, 147 n. 40, 148);

iii/iv AD:

- P.Col. VIII 206:⁷ dual forms of two participles of ποιέω (perf. middle (?) and aor. pass., see col. i 2,6, respectively);

iv AD:

- P.Chester Beatty AC 1499 (ed. Wouters 1988): the codex contains, *inter alia*,

¹ Ed. Zalateo 1940, 7. Pack² 2705. School use: Weems 1981, 30, 92, 265; Debut no. 328; Cribiore 1996, 267 no. 374.

² Ed. H. Oellacher, *MPER* N.S. III (1939) no. 33 B; apparently not from the same roll as P.Vindob. G 29815 A (Pack² 461; re-edited as *GPGRE* 21) with which it was originally published, cf. Wouters 1979, 242-243 n. 10; Weems 1981, 100. Pack² 2167. Regarded as a school-text by Weems 1981, 100-101 (cf. 265); Debut no. 338; Cribiore 1996, 263-264 no. 361.

³ Ed. Oguse 1957, 77-78. Pack² 2163. School use: accepted by Debut no. 349, but regarded as 'questionable' by Cribiore 1996, 286.

⁴ Ed. Zalateo 1940, 8-11. Pack² 2162. School use: Weems 1981, 30-31, 265; Debut no. 339; Cribiore 1996, 264 no. 363.

⁵ Ed. Kenyon 1909, 31. Pack² 2711. School use: Weems 1981, 22-23, 265; Debut no. 342; Cribiore 1996, 264-265 no. 364.

⁶ Ed. Parsons 1970, 145. Pack² 2732. School use: Weems 1981, 28-29, 33-34, 265; Debut no. 345; Cribiore 1996, 273-274 no. 388.

⁷ School use: Cribiore 1996, 265-266 no. 367.

Chapter Two

almost complete conjugations of ποιέω, βοάω, χρυσόω, πλέκω (Frr. 1-10 ¹); dual forms are included;

- P.Ryl. III 533:² dual forms of the fut. pass., fut. middle, and fut. perf. of ποιέω (ll. 5-7, 15-17, 27-29);
- P.Ryl. III 534:³ dual forms of various tenses of the opt., subj., and participle active, middle, and passive of πλέω.

vi AD:

- P.Rain. Unterricht 137:⁴ dual forms of the pres. ind. middle (ll. 2-3) and aor. ind. pass. (12-13) of γράφω;⁵
- P.Rain. Unterricht 138:⁶ conjugations of βοάω and χρυσόω; dual forms have survived only at fr. e recto (unknown tense of the subjunctive);
- Three different tables written on papyri containing documents of Dioscorus of Aphrodito, but not penned by Dioscorus himself:⁷

¹ Ed. Wouters 1988, 26-81. Not catalogued in Cribiore 1996 & 1997, 57.

² Pack² 2166. School use: Weems 1981, 265; Debut no. 346; Cribiore 1996, 265 no. 366.

³ Pack² 2164. School use: accepted by Weems 1981, 103-104, 265 (who suggests a professionally-produced grammar manual or copybook to be used for classroom instruction) and Debut no. 350, but regarded as 'questionable' by Cribiore 1996, 286.

⁴ Published originally by K. Wessely, *SPP* I (1902) 15 (p.viii). Pack² 2735. School use: Weems 1981, 20, 265; Debut no. 340; Harrauer-Sijpesteijn 1985; Cribiore 1996, 268 no. 375.

⁵ Corrections to the latest edition: (a) l. 2 (= i 2): for [ἐ]γράφεσθ[η]ν read γράψεσθ[ο]ν as expected (2nd pers. dual of the pres. ind. middle); (b) l. 12 (= ii 4) [γρ]αφθητον: space requires [ἐ-]γράφθητον as expected (2nd pers. dual of the aor. ind. pass.).

⁶ Frr. a and e were already published by H. Oellacher, *MPER* N.S. III (1939) no. 34, who dated the MS to the late fifth / early sixth century. Pack² 2161. School use: accepted by Weems 1981, 104-105, 265 (who suggests a professionally-produced grammar manual or copybook to be used for classroom instruction); Debut no. 352; Harrauer-Sijpesteijn 1985, but regarded as 'questionable' by Cribiore 1996, 286.

⁷ Cf. Fournet 1997, 303, who did not distinguish, however, between (2) and (3) below. He also cited another unpublished manuscript (P.Cair.Masp. III 67350a-c) which I have been unable to inspect.

- (1) P.Hamb. II 166 + P.Stras. gr. inv. 2454 (unpubl.):¹ dual active, middle, and passive forms of ποιέω in various tenses and moods;
- (2) P.Alex. inv. 689 (unpubl.) + P.Cair.Masp. II 67176 v + III 67275 + III 67351 v:² dual forms of various tenses of the imp. and opt. act., middle, and pass. of ποιέω (67176 v 'page I'), of various tenses of the ind. act., middle, and pass. of χρυσόω (67176 v 'page IV'), of the perf. subj. act. of ποιέω (67351 v);
- (3) P.Cair.Masp. II 67176 r:³ dual forms of the perf. opt. middle of ποιέω (ll. 5-7).

Fournet noticed that five of the tables are written by one and the same hand and suggested that they represent 'le témoignage d'un enseignement dispensé par Dioscore dans un cadre privé' (1997, 303). But their handwriting cannot be that of a student. The format of (1) clearly points to a model for pupils, and (2) may represent a book used by a teacher.⁴ Perhaps Dioscorus used them in his class after having them prepared by someone else. Or perhaps a teacher who was to instruct Dioscorus' sons wrote them on scrap paper provided by Dioscorus.

vii AD:

- P. Rain. Unterricht 139 (Cribiore 1996, 268 no. 377): the fragment, written on the back of BKU III 530 (Coptic lett. ?), preserves dual forms of the perf. (ll. 4-5⁵) and aor. (13-14) imp. pass., of the aor. imp. middle (22-23), of various tenses of the optative (cf. 27 - 68) of χρυσόω.

The manuscript evidence assembled here is remarkably coherent both spatially and chronologically. Schools where pupils were taught dual forms can be spotted in several geographical areas within the boundaries of the Egyptian *chora* (Fayum, Oxyrhynchus, Antinoopolis, Aphrodito, Oasis Maior [?]), and it is evident that the dual was retained in school curriculums for over five centuries. As we shall see, a possible exception to this picture seems to yield no general significance (§ 1.6).

There is evidence to show that the dual was also taught to students in subsequent phases of their grammatical education. With a view to learning and

On Dioscorus see Ch. III § 2.2.4.

- ¹ P. Hamb. 166: Pack² 2165 = 356; Debut no. 347; Cribiore 1996, 268 no. 376. The Strasbourg piece is cited by Fournet (1997, 303 n. 31).
- ² Pack² 355; Debut nos. 344, 351, 353. Not included in Cribiore's catalogue. Fournet has apparently solved the debated question of whether P.Cair.Masp. 67275 v forms part of the same papyrus as the other pieces (Wouters 1979, 18 n. 17; Weems 1981, 107-112, 195-198; Wouters 1988, 33 n. 48 [cf. 32 n. 39]).
- ³ Published as 67176 'page II' and included in Pack² 355. Weems 1981, 110 pointed out that this small portion of conjugation table which appears on the recto of 67176 'may represent a second hand'.
- ⁴ School use: accepted by Debut nos. 344, 353, but considered 'indistinguishable' by Cribiore 1996, 287. Weems (1981, 110, 112) suggested a teacher's model or a scholar's model, but favoured the former. Fournet has recently determined that the four pieces form part of a codex made up of documentary papers (1997, 303).
- ⁵ At l. 4, in place of κεχρυσώσθου (*ed.pr.*) read κεχρύσωσθον as expected (correction on the basis of P. Rain. Unterricht pl. 64).

mastering skills in inflecting cases in actual usage, students were required to 'decline' simple sentences (χρεῖαι) 'by passing the subject of the sentence through all . . . numbers and cases, and adapting the grammar of the context accordingly'.¹ According to Nicholas of Myra (v AD), this exercise, called χρεῖας κλίσις (or προσφορά), was regarded by some authorities as 'sufficient training for the public speech (πολιτικοῦ λόγου) for the youths who have just left the poets and are moving on to rhetoric (τοῖς νέοις . . . ἐπὶ τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἰοῦσιν)'.² The exercise is extant in three late third-century school-texts, in all of which use is made of one and the same *chreia*.³ The texts are: (i) London, BL, Add. MS 37516 recto,⁴ where the exercise is set out in full (note that on the back are the conjugation tables of νικάω mentioned above); (ii) London, BL, Add. MS 37533 tabl. 5b, col. ii 10-19 (= ll. 320-329),⁵ which preserves only a set of formulae for passing the *chreia* through all numbers and cases; (iii) T. Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 5b,⁶ which preserves the same set of formulae of transformation (note that tabl. 7a contains the conjugation of ποιέω mentioned above). The survival of one and the same traditional exercise in these manuscripts is evidence of the conservatism of Graeco-Roman education in Egypt.⁷ In (i), the *chreia* is also inflected in the dual (ll. 7-11), whereas in (ii) and (iii) the formula for passing the *chreia* in the dual is provided (ll. 325-29 [= col. ii 15-19] and 7-11, respectively). The three sets of tablets probably come from the same classroom, since most tablets seem to have been written by the same teacher. In my opinion, they differ in their didactic function.

I believe that Peter Parsons (1970, 147) was correct to suggest that one and the same hand ('Hand C') wrote (a) much of BL, Add. MS 37533 (ed. Kenyon 1909, 32-39);⁸ (b) the

-
- ¹ Theon, *Progymn.* 5, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 101.8-103.2; Nicol. *Progymn.* 18.2 - 19.1 Felten, cf. Parsons 1970, 144 (the words quoted here are his own); Hock-O'Neil 1986, 36, 69; Cribiore 1996, 46. On χρεῖα in Graeco-Roman education see also M. Alexandre Jr, *Ktema* 14 (1989) 161-168.
 - ² Nicol. *Progymn.* 18.2-6 Felten (the translation given here is that of Hock and O'Neil). On Nicholas' date see Felten, *Nicolai Progymnasmata* (BT, 1913) xxii; K. Orinsky, *De Nicolai Myrensis et Libanii quae feruntur progymnasmatis* (Diss. Breslau 1920) 2.
 - ³ Parsons 1970, 144. On this *chreia* see Hock-O'Neil 1986, 335-336.
 - ⁴ Ed. Kenyon 1909, 30.
 - ⁵ Ed. Kenyon 1909, 38. Pack² 2712. School use: Weems 1981, 23, 265; Cribiore 1996, 272 no. 385.
 - ⁶ Ed. Parsons 1970, 143-144.
 - ⁷ Cf. Parsons 1970, 144.
 - ⁸ Some scholars (Weems 1981, 40; Morgan 1995, 73; Cribiore 1996, 272) identified two different hands being at work in this set of tablets: Hand 1 would be responsible for tablets 1b-3a (= ll. 1/2-227), Hand 2 for tablets 4b-5b (= ll. 228-329). According to Weems, a third one would be responsible for l. 1 only. Things seem a little more complicated. In

whole of BL, Add. MS 37516 (ed. Kenyon 1909, 30-31); (c) T. Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tablets 1(a-b) + 4a, 2, 6, 5b (ed. Parsons 1970). Scholarly opinions fluctuate as to whether this is the hand of a school-master or a school-boy,¹ but although palaeography is indecisive, four arguments speak in favour of the former possibility. (i) The London tablet Add. MS 37516 has a holed knob projecting from the left-hand end, which suggests that it was hung on the wall of the class (Kenyon 1909, 29). It is thus likely to have been prepared by the teacher as a visual model for his pupils (I cannot think of a persuasive reason why a school-boy's copy should have been hung on the wall of the class). (ii) Each of the three sets has the look of a professional copy (Parsons 1970, 147). (iii) In Add. MS 37533 and in T. Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019, Hand C also penned a variety of exercises, many of which are characteristic of *progymnasmata* (*chreiai*, paraphrases etc.). The two sets of tablets thus seem to be professional repertoires of a teacher. (iv) Parsons 1970, 147 pointed out that the conjugation table of ποίω in T. Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 7a is not written by Hand C. He described the hand ('Hand B') as 'thick' and 'crude'. The table may have been the morphological exercise of a student.² As Hand C is more competent, it cannot have been the hand of an equal-level student. The three manuscripts may represent the lucky find of texts prepared by and for a teacher of grammar and elementary rhetoric.

In this classroom, one and the same school-master was entrusted with the task of teaching both classical morphology and how to use it correctly in actual composition. Students were first required to learn the nominal and verbal inflections by writing down conjugation lists (cf. T. Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 7a) on the basis of model tables put by the school-master at their visual disposal (cf. Add. MS 37516 verso).³

Then they were asked to master their skill in inflecting whole sentences on the basis of models which were on display in the classroom (cf. Add. MS 37516 recto). They fulfilled this requirement by means of formulae of transformation provided by the school-master (Add. MS 37533 tabl. 5b; T. Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 5b). In this

my opinion, Hand 2 also wrote small parts of the tablets assigned to Hand 1, that is, ll. 51-58, 115-117 (only the verbs), 159-160. I regard Parsons' Hand C as the same as Hand 2 here.

- ¹ Scholars agree that the script, though unattractive, is still practised enough to suggest a mature writer, cf. Parsons 1970, 141, 147; Weems 1981, 40; Cribiore 1996, 265, 272, 274 (for the meaning of her term 'rapid' see p. 112). Yet they disagree about whether this indicates an advanced student or a teacher, and consequently about the ownership of the tablets. Thus, (a) the Oxford set is regarded as a teacher's copy by Parsons 1970, 141 and 147 (as regards his apparent afterthought at the end of 147, I do not think that the occurrence of the very beginning of a new copy of the Homeric paraphrase at T. Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 4a necessarily suggests an exercise) but apparently as a student's book by Cribiore 1996, 274; (b) BL, Add. MS 37516: pupil's copy in Cribiore's judgement (1996, 265, cf. 114 n. 101), whereas Weems 1981, 40 is undecided; (c) BL, Add. MS 37533: pupil's copy according to Kenyon 1909, 31 n. 4; Weems 1981, 40; Cribiore 1996, 272.
- ² Cf. also § 1.2 above and Cribiore 1996, 274 (for the meaning of the term 'evolving' see p. 112). For a different opinion see Weems 1981, 41.
- ³ Likewise, P. Hamb. II 166 may have been hung on the wall of the class (B. Snell, *P. Hamb. II* [1954] p. 115) so as to be 'used as a master copy from which pupils could prepare

Chapter Two

classroom, like elsewhere,¹ the dual was taught in both phases of the educational process.

1.3.2. Another unusual element is the first person dual middle ending -μεθον. In extant Greek literature, it is confined to Hom. *Il.* 23. 485 (v.l. -μεθα), Soph. *El.* 950 (v.l. -μεθα), Phil. 1079 (v.l. -μεθα), and Athen. *Deipn.* 98 A (2x), where it is used as an archaism.² Nevertheless, it is found not only in Theodosius' *Canons* (see esp. Hilgard, *Gramm. Gr.* IV 1, p. 54.22-23) and in the *Tabula* (*passim*), but also in all (or almost all) the conjugation tables which have been listed in § 1.3.1 as evidence for the teaching of the dual: cf. P.Stras. inv. 364+16 (ed. Oguse 1957, 77-78) col. i 6,34; PSI inv. 204 verso (ed. Zalateo 1940, 8-11) ll. 42,52,62,72; BL, Add. MS 37516 verso (ed. Kenyon 1909, 31) col. iii 10,14,21,25,29; P.Chester Beatty AC 1499 (ed. Wouters 1988, 37 ff.), *passim*; P.Ryl. III 533 ll. 5,15,27; P.Ryl. III 534 ll. 16,21,31,65; P.Hamb. II 166 e.g. ll. 80, 93,106,118; P.Cair.Masp. II 67176 v, 'page IV' cols. ii 5,17,19 and iii 9,21,33; P.Cair.Masp. II 67176 'page II' (l. 5). The only exception would be P.Rain.Unterricht 137 (vi AD) if the editors' reading γραφε[τ]α (l. 1) were correct. But one can equally read γραφό[μ]ε[θ]ον: the foot of upright descending below the notional baseline may be as much μ as τ, and the supposed trace of ι seems too tiny to allow certainty about the letter.

1.3.3. The optative is regularly found in Theodosius' *Canons* and the *Tabula* (Uhlig, *Gramm. Gr.* I 1, pp. 128 col. iii 30 - 130 col. i 22), and has survived in the following papyri:³

late iii AD:

- London, BL, Add. MS 37516 verso (ed. Kenyon 1909, 31): conjugation of νικάω displaying forms of the pres., perf., aor., fut. optative active, of the pres., perf., aor. optative middle, and also optative forms of the aor. and fut. pass.;

iv AD:

- P.Chester Beatty AC 1499 (ed. Wouters 1988): almost complete conjugations of ποιέω, βοάω, χρυσόω, πλέκω, including optative forms;
- P.Ryl. III 534: optative forms of the perf. middle (ll. 1-3), aor. pass. (ll. 5-11), aor., fut. middle (ll. 13-16, 18-26), and fut. pass. of πλέω;

vi AD:

- P.Rain. Unterricht 138: of χρυσόω, optative forms of the perf. and aor. active (fr. e verso), fut. act. (?) (fr. f recto), and aor. or fut. pass. (fr. g recto);
- P.Hamb. II 166: optative forms of the aor. and fut. active, of the pres., perf., and aor. middle, of the aor. and fut. pass., and of the fut. perf. of ποιέω;
- P.Cair.Masp. II 67176 v 'page I': various tenses of the opt. act. and middle of ποιέω (col. iii 4 ff.);
- P.Cair.Masp. II 67176 (r) 'page II': perf. opt. middle of ποιέω;

paradigms for individual study' (Weems 1981, 107).

¹ Cf. Nicol. *Progymn.* 18.35-19.1 Felten.

² Cf. Schwyzler I 672 (with further bibl.); Chantraine 1961, 307.

³ For bibliography on the following manuscripts see § 1.3.1 above.

vii AD:

— P. Rain. Unterricht 139: optative forms of the perf., aor., and fut. active of χρυσόω (ll. 38-68).

I know of no case of a conjugation table omitting the optative.

1.3.4. The perfect imperative active is very rare in extant Greek literature,¹ but appears (i) in Theodosius' *Canons* (Hilgard, *Gramm. Gr.* IV 1, p. 64.20-24) and the *Tabula* (Uhlig, *Gramm. Gr.* I 1, p. 128 col. i 15-22); (ii) in P.Stras. inv. 364+16 col. ii 3 ff. (ed. Oguse 1957, 77-78) (ii AD), P.Hamb. II 166. 223 ff. (vi AD), and P.Cair.Masp. II 67176 v 'page I' col. i 39 ff. (vi AD). Evidently the perfect imperative active was taught in Greek schools in the Egyptian *chora* from the Roman period through to the Byzantine age. A. Oguse suggested that the forms of this tense were not borrowed from actual literature, but were devised on theoretical grounds.² Yet the same hypothesis cannot explain the presence, in conjugation tables, of such a learned feature as the dual ending -μεθον (§ 1.3.2). This fact is a warning against dismissing the possibility that the forms of the perfect imperative active were also derived from literary usage.

1.4. It cannot be denied; however, that in antiquity the teaching of morphology had an artificial connotation. The archaistically-oriented revival of obsolete forms is in itself an indication of this tendency. Furthermore, non-existent forms were often devised on analogical grounds to fill the gaps in the inflectional series for the sake of completeness and regularity.³ Verbal paradigms occasionally display odd forms which seem to have been coined theoretically.⁴ Plural and dual forms of mythological and historical personal names as found not only in declension tables but also in inflectional paradigms of entire sentences (cf. § 1.3.1) could help students to master case endings, but had no reality in literature, a fact of which the ancients were fully aware.⁵ The artificial character of grammatical education is not restricted to the Graeco-Roman world. In Italian primary education, which bears some resemblance to ancient Greek education,⁶ for example, pupils are required to learn tenses such as the *trapassato*

¹ Cf. J.H. Harry, *CR* 19 (1905) 353; Id., *TAPhA* 37 (1906) 58.

² Cf. Oguse 1957, 82.

³ On the importance of analogy in the construction of paradigms see A. Scaglione, *Ars Grammatica* (The Hague 1970) 58-59. On analogy as a criterion of correctness in the ancient grammatical science see Siebenborn 1976, 62-84.

⁴ Cf. Oguse 1957, 82-83; Wouters 1988, 80-81.

⁵ Cf. Nicholas of Myra, *Progymn.* 18.35-19.1 Felten.

⁶ In Italian schools, boys and girls aged between eleven and thirteen (that is, children probably as old as pupils who attended the grammarian's class in antiquity, see § 1.7) are usually taught verbal morphology by means of conjugation tables. Although the Italian educational system displays no archaising or puristic tendency proper, vulgar language is strictly avoided. Students,

remoto passive which are employed only exceptionally in today's usage.

1.5. The teaching of voice seems to have been characterised by the same archaising tendency. The late third-century textbook BL, Add. MS 37533 (ed. Kenyon 1909, 32 ff.), possibly a professional repertory of a teacher (§ 1.3.1), contains *inter alia plura* a long list of verbs grouped approximately according to their meanings (ed. Kenyon 1909, 32-36). Recommendations about the correct voice of verbs are added in many entries in a form (X, οὐ λέγεται Y) which recalls the Atticist lexica.¹ Evidently they set out to combat the frequent confusion of voice in contemporary living speech. The reader, possibly the school-master himself, is thus reminded to refrain or to urge students to refrain from using (i) the active where the middle is correct;² (ii) the middle where the active is correct.³

(i) Verbs for which the use of the middle is recommended instead of the active:

- ll. 204-205 αἰσχύνομαι (+ acc. of pers.) 'feel shame before sb.', not αἰσχύνω;
- ll. 162-163 ἀντιποιέομαι 'seek after, lay claim to a thing', not ἀντιποιέω;
- ll. 22-23 ἀποστρέφομαι (+ acc. of pers.) 'turn away from, abandon sb.', not -στρέφω;
- ll. 24-25 βδελύττομαι (+ acc. of pers.) 'detest sb.', not βδελύττω;
- l. 155 βούλομαι (+ acc. of pers.) 'desire sb.', not βούλω (Gignac II 326);
- l. 177 ἐπείγομαι 'haste(n)', not ἐπείγω;
- ll. 18-19, 79-80 ἐπικαλέομαι (+ acc. of pers.) 'call upon, appeal to sb.', not -καλέω;
- ll. 191-192 μιμέομαι (+ gen. instead of the acc.!) 'imitate sb.', not μιμέω;
- ll. 94-95 ὀργίζομαι (+ dat. of pers.) 'be angry at sb.', not ὀργίζω;
- l. 161 προθυμέομαι [προσθυμαι Tab.: *corr. ed. pr.*] 'be eager', not προθυμέω;
- l. 137 προτρέπομαι (+ acc. of pers.) 'urge sb.', not -τρέπω.

(ii) Verbs for which the use of the active is recommended instead of the middle:

- ll. 182-183 λιτανεύω (+ acc. of pers.) 'pray sb.', not λιτανεύομαι;
- l. 47 πλουτέω 'be rich', not πλουτέομαι;
- l. 176 σπεύδω [σπένδω Tab.: *correxī* ⁴] 'haste(n), seek after', not σπεύδομαι [σπένδομαι Tab.: *correxī*].

1.6. Model tables occur which exhibit occasional deviations from classical morphology. The third-century codex PSI inv. 204 (ed. Zalateo 1940, 8-11), which

for instance, are expected to improve their knowledge of the subjunctive, which is nowadays particularly liable to misuse or neglect in living speech and is increasingly becoming a sign of language cultivation.

¹ Phrynichus, for instance, has X λέγεται, ἀλλ' [ἀλλ' B: om. b] οὐκ Y at *Ecl.* 48 Fischer. Cf. also the style (X, οὐκ Y) of *De propria dictione* gll. 7-9 Palmieri (1988, 240-241); on the Atticist character of these glosses see Palmieri 1988, 75.

² On this phenomenon cf. the bibliography cited at App. (B) § 1.7 C no. 4. One more ex.: App. (B) § 1.3 no. 3.

³ On this phenomenon cf. the bibliography cited at App. (B) § 1.7 A no. 4. One more ex.: App. (B) § 1.6 E (b) 1.

⁴ σπεύδω is expected, since the verb is associated with ἐπείγομαι, κατεπείγω, διώκω. Both σπένδω and σπένδομαι are clearly scribal errors.

conforms to normal archaising education in other respects (§§ 1.3.1, 1.3.2), displays a number of Koine features:¹ (i) the standard late Attic and Koine inflection of the pluperfect (-ειν, -εις, -ει, -ειτον, -ειτην, -ειμεν, -ειτε, -εισαν), cf. verso col. i 11 ff.; (ii) two inflectional characteristics of post-classical vulgar Greek, namely the 2nd person singular perfect indicative active ending -ες (recto col. i 4)² and the 2nd person singular aorist indicative active ending -ες (recto col. ii 3).³ Both are very interesting, but the implications of (i) seem to be of greater significance than those of (ii).

Linguistically, the pluperfect paradigm found in this papyrus deviates from old Attic usage.⁴ However, while disagreeing with classical Attic,⁵ the 1st and 2nd person singular endings -ειν, -εις are standard features of literary and non-literary Koine of any stylistic level,⁶ whereas the 3rd person plural ending -εισαν in place of -εσαν conflicts not only with allegedly normal classical Athenian usage — in fact MSS sometimes have -εισαν —,⁷ but also with Atticism's puristic requirements (Phryn. *Ecl.* 119 Fischer) and with archaising post-classical usage.⁸ Yet precisely the same inflection as the Florentine papyrus, including both -ειν and -εισαν, occurs (a) in Theodosius' *Canons* (Hilgard, *Gramm. Gr.* IV 1, pp. 50.19-51.12); (b) in the *Tabula* (Uhlig, *Gramm. Gr.* I 1, p. 125 col. iii 20-27); (c) in P.Hamb. II 166 (vi AD), cf. ll. 41-50. (In the sixth-century P.Cair.Masp. II 67176 v 'page IV' col. i 2-4, the gaps obscure most of the paradigm.) The Attic endings -η (for -ειν) and -εσαν (for -εισαν) are mentioned with disapproval by the later grammarian George Choeroboscus in his commentary on the rules for the

¹ Cf. Weems 1981, 68-69.

² On this feature see Appendix (B) § 1.7 C no. 2 (with bibliography).

³ On this feature see Appendix (B) § 1.5 A (with bibliography).

⁴ In general, on the pluperfect endings cf. especially S. Mekler, *Beiträge zur Bildung des gr. Verbums* (Diss. Dorpat 1887) II 43-90.

⁵ -η in Attic writers: Kühner-Blass II 52,66. No ex. of the first person sing. ending has yet appeared in inscriptions.

⁶ Papyri: Mayser I 2, pp. 80-81; Mandilaras 1973 §§ 485-486; Gignac II 356 (who correctly points out that 'occasional forms in -ην . . . are orthographic variants of the normal ending -ειν'). No ex. of old Attic -η recorded.

⁷ Cf. Kühner-Blass II 65. Inscriptions: only one ex. of -εσαν in a source of 323/2 BC, see Threutte II 453. Cf. Herodian's observation cited below.

⁸ Hell. Greek: Polybius: the frequency rate of -εισαν:-εσαν seems to be 23:6, see A. Schoy, *De perfecti usu Polybiano* (Bonn 1913) 67, de Foucault 1972, 76; papyri: several exx. of -εισαν (also in the misspelled form -ησαν) versus one (doubtful) late second-century BC ex. of -εσαν (Mayser I 2, p. 85.31 ff.; Mandilaras 1973 § 490). Rom. and Byz. Greek: no ex. of -εσαν in the NT (Blass-

pluperfect inflection as established by Theodosius' *Canons*.¹ His belief that -εἰσαν is to be preferred to -εσαν by analogy to -εἰν seems to stem from the second-century Alexandrian grammarian Herodian.² The agreement between two chronologically far apart papyrus witnesses suggests that the non-archaising inflection of the pluperfect was in actual fact the only kind of pluperfect paradigm taught in Greek schools in the Egyptian *chora* at least in the late Roman and Byzantine periods. This teaching seems to have reflected grammatical canons established by authoritative Alexandrian scholars. Its departure not only from the normal archaising orientation of Greek education but also from Atticist purism has solid foundations in the Alexandrian systematisation of verbal inflection. Neither the occurrence of -εἰν nor that of -εἰσαν in the two papyrus tables are mistakes.³

On the other hand, the aorist and perfect endings -εξ are very surprising in view of their vulgar character; it is no wonder that they are not shared by other conjugation tables. The roughly contemporary T.Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 7a (ed. Parsons 1970, 145), possibly written by a pupil (p. 76), has πεποίηκας (col. i 10) and ἐποίησας (col. ii 7⁴). The later P.Hamb. II 166 (vi AD), possibly written by or for a teacher (pp. 74 n. 4, 76 n. 3), exhibits ἐποίησας (l. 53⁵). If the writer of PSI inv. 204 were a student,⁶ those features could be regarded as mistakes of little import. But the script of the papyrus codex is a bookhand, which is neither calligraphic nor regular in execution, but practised enough to suggest an experienced writer. The aorist and perfect endings -εξ may thus be simple scribal banalisations introduced by a clerk who had been entrusted with the task of copying the text. Alternatively, they may have originated from the pen of the school-master himself, possibly because of professional incompetence or lack of attention.⁷ The fact that there are two cases of mistaken use of

Debrunner-Rehkopf § 86) and the papyri; classicising literature: Philostratus reportedly has 2 exx. of -εσαν versus 2 cases of -εἰσαν, cf. Schmid IV 27; more refs. will be found in Mayser I 2, p. 85 n. 1.

¹ Georg. Choerob. *Scholia in Theod. Can.*, ed. Hilgard, *Gramm.Gr.* IV 1, pp. 113.19 ff. (-εἰν), 118. 35-119 (-η), 121.23 ff. (-εἰσαν), 122.11 ff. (-εσαν). Choeroboscus is nowadays dated to the ninth century, see Ch. Theodoridis, *ByzZ* 73 (1980) 341-345; Kaster 1988, 395-396; cf. also Alpers 1981, 91 n. 25.

² Georg. Choerob. *Scholia in Theod. Can.*, ed. Hilgard, *Gramm.Gr.* IV 1, pp. 122.11 ff.; Herodian, *Περὶ παθῶν* fr. 332 Lentz (*Gramm. Gr.* III 2, 1, p. 279).

³ Pace Weems 1981, 68-69 and Cribiore 1996, 93.

⁴ ἐποίηκας in the *ed.pr.* is a misprint.

⁵ The 2nd person singular perfect indicative active ending got lost in the lacuna at the top.

⁶ So Zalateo 1940, 8 (followed, it seems, by Weems 1981, 31) and apparently Cribiore 1996.

⁷ If it had been the school-master who penned the papyrus, he is unlikely to have deliberately

the 3rd person dual ending -την for -τον on the recto (cols. i 7 and ii 15, respectively) versus no such error on the verso does not necessarily support either possibility.¹

One wonders how far such deviations from 'correct' Greek influenced the level of grammatical education of pupils. We may suppose (i) that a low standard of teaching as revealed by the occurrence of reliable indicators of professional incompetence in teachers' repertoires caused imperfect linguistic learning; (ii) that the learning of students could also be influenced by defective models. As we have seen, however, not only the exact origin of errors found in textbooks but also the authorship, ownership, and utilisation of manuscripts may be hard to determine objectively. For instance, in order to suggest that the vulgar linguistic features found in PSI inv. 204 affected the degree of linguistic competence of pupils, one should first find out whether they were introduced by an incompetent teacher and/or whether the codex was handled by students. But we cannot verify either possibility. Moreover, to what extent linguistic shortcomings of textbooks and models really affected students' knowledge of grammar is impossible to determine in the light of the present evidence. The exercise in *χρείας κλίσις* preserved by BL, Add. MS 37516 recto (ed. Kenyon 1909, 30), which a teacher apparently used as a visual model for his pupil or pupils (§ 1.3.1), displays several grammatical errors, including a case of extension of the 3rd person dual ending -την to the 2nd person (l. 11).² There is no telling how far pupils reproduced these errors in their own copies of the exercise. Indeed, in an exercise in verbal conjugation a student of that teacher mistakenly extended the dual active ending -την of the secondary tenses to such primary tenses as the present, perfect, and future indicative.³ He might have followed a defective model supplied by his teacher, but the hypothesis cannot be verified because that model has been lost.⁴ In fact, we cannot exclude the possibility that the school-master compiled the table of the indicative more carefully than he did with BL, Add. MS 37516 recto. It may be noted that errors found in this tablet

removed endings characteristic of contemporary standard Greek, while retaining such strong archaisms as the dual (§ 1.3.1) and the ending -μεθον (§ 1.3.2). Furthermore, the slowly-written script militates against the hypothesis that the writer compiled the table hastily.

¹ On the difficulty in classifying errors see Wouters 1988, 72, 74-75. For extensive discussions of mistakes found in school-texts see Weems 1981, 50-76 and Cribiore 1996, 91-96. Cf. also Wouters 1988, 72-75.

² Cf. Weems 1981, 71.

³ T.Bodl. Greek Inscription 3019 tabl. 7a (ed. Parsons 1970, 145), cols. iii 5, iv 1, iv 10; cf. Weems 1981, 72. For the hypothesis that this tablet was written by a student who attended the class from which BL, Add. MS 37516 comes, see § 1.3.1.

⁴ His extant conjugation table (BL, Add. MS 37516 verso, ed. Kenyon 1909, 31) does not contain any tense of the indicative active.

seem to have been caused by lack of attention rather than by incompetence.¹

Further examples could be adduced. In the third-century P. Rain. Unterricht 136² fr. b (conjugation of the pres. ind. act. of βάπτω), the singular is followed by the plural. The dual must have been omitted by the scribe, unless of course it unusually came after the plural (the papyrus breaks after this). The poor condition of the papyrus prevents us from telling whether the omission, if made at all, was reiterated through the whole of the conjugation or was confined to the present indicative active. If the latter was the case, the omission might result from simple lack of attention, whereas the former possibility would no doubt involve a precise standpoint inconsistent with the normal orientation of the contemporary educational system (§ 1.3.1). Neither possibility can be excluded in principle as the table seems to have been written by an incompetent school-master.³ This uncertainty makes it impossible to tell whether students who attended that class were taught the dual or not.

The writer of P. Chester Beatty AC 1499 (ed. Wouters 1988, 37 ff.) fairly consistently committed grammatical errors in certain morphological realms, which points to low level linguistic competence. The dual was particularly subject to inaccuracies. According to Wouters' estimates (1988, 73), there is an impressive percentage of uncorrected errors which disfigure the 3rd person endings: -την is mistakenly written instead of -τον in 87.5 % of all the attestations of the ending; the expected -την appears as -τον in 44.44 % of cases; -σθην is erroneously replaced by -σθον in 47.82 % of cases. The writer made exceedingly frequent errors in the formation of tense stems (cf. e.g. ll. 852-856, 860-868). Furthermore, the omission of the augment in three out of four series of pluperfect indicative middle forms shows that the writer was heavily influenced by contemporary linguistic usage.⁴ Unfortunately, as we do not know whether this codex was prepared by a school-master or whether it was used by a

¹ For instance, only absent-mindedness can explain the mistaken reading συνεβουλεύσατον instead of συνεβούλευσας at l. 5. Furthermore, the ink shows that the writer penned short pericopes of text regardless to the sense. In that passage, he lifted the pen after συνεβου-, took more ink, and then wrote the rest.

² School use: Cribiore 1996, 265 no. 365.

³ The small scraps display several remarkable errors: cf. (i) βλέπ- for βλέπ- throughout the inflection at fr. a; (ii) βάπτμεν βάπττε for βάπτομεν βάπττετε at fr. b 7-8 (judging from the published plate, βάπττε seems probable, but βάπττετ- is not excluded; βάπττετε [ed.pr., cf. Harrauer-Sijpesteijn 1985, 128] looks improbable. In any case, if βαπτ(ε)ιτ- is read, I cannot see any scribal correction to βάπττετε, pace Harrauer-Sijpesteijn 1985, 128); (iii) various itacist misspellings. The script, a rather fast cursive, is fluent enough to suggest an experienced hand (cf. Harrauer-Sijpesteijn 1985, 128; Cribiore 1996, 265).

⁴ Wouters 1988, 74. On the phenomenon see Ch. IV § 1.2.2.

Chapter Two

pupil as a textbook,¹ we are unable to tell whether it is an illustration of how living speech and incompetence affected the teaching of grammar in an individual class.

1.7. To sum up, it is evident that youths aged approximately twelve who attended the grammarian's lessons² were mainly taught the classical inflectional system. The evidence for the teaching of voice points in the same direction (§ 1.5). With the exclusion of the standard Koine pluperfect paradigm, Graeco-Roman education ignored the developments of contemporary Greek.³ A variety of explanations for this phenomenon has been considered, but there is scope for further reflection.⁴ Every individual who was fortunate enough to receive grammatical schooling can in principle be credited with some awareness and knowledge of many features of classical Greek. Unfortunately, we do not know how many people received that kind of education, that is, how many carried on after being taught the rudiments of writing. Nor can we tell how many students withdrew before taking up rhetoric.

It seems, however, that the archaising character of the teaching of Greek was subject to compromises with living speech in schools throughout the Egyptian *chora*. Although it is difficult to prove it irrefutably, it seems that the degree of professional competence of individual school-masters and/or the level of grammatical correctness of textbooks used for school instruction affected the level of linguistic learning of pupils. Linguistic competence of educated individuals may thus have been subject to inequalities originating in the standard of teaching which they were offered during their youth. Such differences are wholly undetectable in prose performance.

-
- ¹ For a tentative suggestion about its use see Wouters 1988, 167. The handwriting seems too fluent and practised for a pupil attending the grammarian's lessons.
- ² On the age of pupils who studied grammar see Kleijwegt 1991, 90.
- ³ Frösén 1974, 165, followed by Bubeník 1989, 17, asserted that 'the colloquial standard' was 'the language of . . . primary education' during post-classical periods. If this means that that linguistic variety of post-classical Greek was taught to students, the evidence plainly proves it wrong. If, on the other hand, the assertion aims to suggest that the 'colloquial standard' was used for personal communication between teachers and students, that cannot be verified against actual evidence.
- ⁴ Cf. Wouters 1988, 80; Morgan 1995, 79 ff. It is significant that no inflectional tables are attested before the late first century AD (cf. Maehler 1983, 201; Morgan 1995, 80) and that, therefore, Greek grammar was not taught to pupils during the Hellenistic period. This fact needs to be assessed in the light of the (controversial) development of Greek grammatical scholarship on inflection before Theodosius' *Canons* (see p. 69 n. 4).

2. ANCIENT RHETORICAL THEORIES OF THE EPISTOLARY STYLE AND ITS STYLISTIC VARIATIONS

2.0. In the Graeco-Roman world, rhetoric could exert a considerable influence on spoken and written performance, since it set norms of good stylistic usage for individuals who wanted to speak and write well.¹ In view of their accepted normative character, these rules can be used as objective criteria for assessing the style of prose writings. Writers themselves may have been aware of rhetorical prescriptions on the genre to which their compositions belong. In this section, I shall thus discuss Greek theories of the epistolary style² with a view to defining a normative stylistic context for the letters to be examined in subsequent chapters.

2.1. PRESCRIPTIONS ON STYLE

2.1.1. The earliest surviving discussion of the epistolary style appears in Pseudo-Demetrius of Phalerum's *Περὶ ἑρμηνείας*,³ a treatise on stylistics of controversial authorship and date.⁴ For convenience, I shall call the unknown author 'Demetrius' and shall assume a date no earlier than the second half of the third century BC and no later than the first century AD. The treatise sets out to discuss four fundamental types of style or manners of writing (χαρακτῆρες) — the 'grand' (μεγαλοπρεπής), the 'elegant' (γλαφυρός), the 'plain' (ἰσχνός), the 'forceful' (δεινός) — and their reciprocal combinations in actual usage.⁵ The section which deals with letter-writing (223-235) represents a self-contained excursus on the plain style which enjoyed

¹ Note that rhetoric was defined as ἐπιστήμη (or δύναμις) τοῦ εὖ λέγειν and as *bene dicendi scientia*. For references to, and discussions of, the relevant sources cf. J. Martin 1974, 4-5; Calboli Montefusco 1979, 249-251 (with more bibliography).

² For concise surveys of the relevant sources see Weichert 1910, xii-xvii; Sykutris 1931, 193.13-195.4; Malherbe 1988, 13-14; Reed 1997, 182-186. In general, on ancient epistolary theorists see most recently Malherbe 1988; on their relationship with rhetoric see also Reed 1997.

³ Ed. Chiron 1993. For a recent survey of arguments against Demetrius' authorship see Chiron 1993, xv-xviii.

⁴ Most recent discussions of these issues include Grube 1961, 22-23, 39-56; G.P. Goold, *TAPhA* 92 (1961) 178-189; Rist 1964, (esp.) 8; Grube 1964; Schenkeveld 1964; Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1980, 141-149; Chiron 1993, xiii-xl.

⁵ On Demetrius' theory of the four styles see most recently Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1980, 75-119; Chiron 1993, (esp.) lxxxii-cvii.

something of an autonomous life in the manuscript tradition.¹ As Grube has emphasised, this digression is appropriate where it occurs, since the epistolary style is regarded as a particular application of the plain style with an additional 'admixture' of elegance;² it is, therefore, an example of mixed style.

2.1.1.1. Clarity and simplicity are regarded by Demetrius as major determinants of style selection as much in letter-writing as in all the other genres which normally make use of the plain style. A letter is defined as 'an exposition of a simple subject in simple terms' (περὶ ἀπλοῦ πράγματος ἔκθεσις καὶ ἐν ὀνόμασιν ἀπλοῖς) (231). Subject-matter must be ordinary: philosophic and scientific discussions are deemed unfit for a letter, since they would turn it into a treatise (231). Similarly, the plain style is said to require the use of humble subjects (πράγματα . . . τινὰ μικρά) (190). The stylistic tenor must also be kept low, since according to Demetrius a stilted style would alienate a letter from its true nature.³ Clarity (σαφήνεια) is regarded as the principal goal of those compositions which aim at a plain style,⁴ including letters (226). The need for simplicity and clarity, therefore, influences performance and must determine the choice of the appropriate modes of expression (§§ 2.1.1.2-2.1.1.4).

2.1.1.2. Sentence structure was regarded by Demetrius as a major target for stylistic concern. At the beginning of his digression on letter-writing, he questions the principle expressed by a certain Artemon that letters should be written in the style of dialogue.⁵ Demetrius acknowledges the existence of affinities between letter-writing and

¹ Cf. Chiron 1993, 63 n. 297. On this section cf. esp. Koskenniemi 1956, 21 ff.; Thraede 1970, 17-25.

² *De eloc.* 223, 235; cf. §§ 2.1.1.1-2.1.1.4 and 2.1.1.5, respectively. Cf. Grube 1961, 29.

³ Cf. 228 συνεστάλω τῆς ἐπιστολῆς . . . ἡ λέξις, αἱ δὲ . . . κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ὀγκωδέστεραι, οὐ μὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπιστολαὶ γένοιντο ἄν, ἀλλὰ συγγράμματα. The terms λέξις and ἐρμηνεία are equivalent here as elsewhere: they mean 'style' (so Rhys Roberts, Chiron) and not 'language' (so Grube 1961, 112).

⁴ Cf. 191 μάλιστα δὲ σαφὴ χρὴ τὴν λέξιν εἶναι; 203 μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς ἰσχυοῖς αὐτῇ (*scil.* σαφηνεία) λόγοις χρηστέον; cf. also 192, 196-198, 201, 202 etc.

⁵ Cf. *De eloc.* 223-227. The identity of this Artemon, who is recorded in other sources as a compiler of a collection of Aristotle's letters (Koskenniemi 1956, 24 n. 3), is unknown. Scholars have proposed to identify him with (i) the late second-century BC grammarian Artemon of Cassandreia (on whom see Wentzel, *RE* II 2 [1896] 1446-1447 s.v. 'Artemon 18'); cf. Sykutris 1931, 189.59 ff.; P. Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain 1951) 143 n. 53; Rist 1964, 8; Chiron 1993, xxxviii; doubts: Wentzel, 'Artemon' 1447.25 ff.; Kroll, *RE* Suppl. VII (1940) 1079.40 ff.; *contra*: Koskenniemi 1956, 25; Grube 1961, 42-43; Grube 1964, 301-302; J. Werner, in *Der Kleine Pauly* I (1979) 626 s.v. 'Artemon' 1; (ii) Pindar's commentator Artemon of Pergamon: cf. now Chiron 1993,

dialogue (224, 227), but denies a full identity (224).¹ In his opinion, letters are written texts (224, 226), whereas dialogue is an imitation (224, 226) of extemporary utterance (224). While suiting a debate (ἀγών) and the performance of an actor (ὑποκριτής) (226), the mimetic character of dialogue is unsuitable for letter-writing, which is a form of written composition (224, 226). Particularly instructive remarks can be found in *De eloc.* 226, where the beginning of Plato's *Euthydemus* (271 a), a piece of asyndetic prose, is advanced as an example of imitative style (ἐρμηνεία καὶ μίμησις) particularly unsuitable for letters. The frequent use of disjunctions between sequences (λύσεις συχναί [ἴσχυαί PM, *teste* Chiron : *corr.* Victorius (Pier Vettori)]) is viewed as characteristic of the conversational style but as inappropriate to letter-writing, since in a written text it leads to obscurity (226).

These views become clearer once they are set in the context of Demetrius' treatment of sentence structure.² Much in the vein of Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3. 9. 1409 a 24-35), Demetrius draws (12) a distinction between a 'periodic' style (ἐρμηνεία κατεστραμμένη; same term as Aristotle) and a kind of articulation of sequences which is 'divided up' (διηρημένη ἐρμηνεία; cf. 13 διαλελυμένης ἐρμηνείας; cf. Aristotle's εἰρομένη) because of its being 'dissolved in mutually disjoined cola' (ἡ εἰς κῶλα λελυμένη οὐ μάλα ἀλλήλοις συνηρημένα).³ The same distinction is resumed later (193) while discussing the main features of the plain style, that is, the style which basically characterises letter-writing. A structure which is made up of disjoined sequences of utterance (διαλελυμένη λέξις) is distinguished from a period which consists of units joined together by means of connectives (i.e. particles and

xxxviii, although previous scholars (including Wentzel, 'Artemon' 1447) were sceptic — Chiron's further hypothesis that Artemon of Cassandreia and Artemon of Pergamon are one and the same person is at best unprovable, cf. Wentzel, 'Artemon' 1446-1447 (esp. 1447.24-25); Werner and others have rejected it; (iii) a pupil of Aristotle, cf. Koskenniemi 1956, 25; Grube 1964, 301.

¹ The report of Malherbe (1988, 13) on the matter is inaccurate.

² The interpretation of many details of Demetrius' theory of colon and period as well as of its relationship with that of Aristotle is in dispute: cf. J. Zehetmeier, *Philologus* 85 (1930) 192-208, 255-284, 414-436; Schenkeveld 1964, 28 ff.; Calboli Montefusco 1979, 463-464; Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1980, 41-72; Fowler 1982; Chiron 1993, lxvii ff.; Dover 1997, 37-40. Cf. also J. Martin 1974, 315-320; E. Siebenborn, in D.J. Taylor (ed.), *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period* (Amsterdam 1986) 229-249, and the bibliography cited by Calboli Montefusco 1979, 466. Influence of Demetrius' theory on later rhetoric: Calboli Montefusco 1979, 464-466.

³ Cf. most recently Dover 1997, 38. The identity between Aristotle's εἰρομένη and Demetrius' διηρημένη/(δια)λελυμένη has rightly been defended by Fowler 1982, 94. Demetrius did not distinguish between λέξις διαλελυμένη and διηρημένη ἐρμηνεία, *pace* J. Martin 1974, 315-316. As Fowler 1982, 94 n. 26 has pointed out, such a distinction

conjunctions) (λέξεις . . . συνηρημένη καὶ οἶον ἡσφαλισμένη τοῖς συνδέσμοις).¹ The presence or absence of asyndeton² is thus a key factor in distinguishing between attitudes towards sentence structure (cf. 192). The realms of applicability of each kind of period articulation as defined at 193 significantly agree with those stated at 226 *à propos* of letter-writing: the disarticulated and asyndetic form of discourse is said to be suitable to debates (ἐναγώνιος) and the theatrical scene (ἥ δ' αὐτὴ καὶ ὑποκριτικὴ καλεῖται· κινεῖ γὰρ ὑπόκρισιν ἢ λύσις),³ whereas the periodic sentence structure is deemed appropriate to written compositions conceived to be read (γραφικὴ δὲ λέξις ἢ εὐανάγνωστος).

Demetrius' views may be set out schematically as follows:

- (a) style (ἐρμηνεία or λέξεις) called κατεστραμμένη:
 - characteristics: presence of connectives (particles, conjunctions) between cola; absence of asyndeton;
 - suitability for: written texts composed to be read;
- (b) style (ἐρμηνεία or λέξεις) called διαλελυμένη or διηρημένη:
 - characteristics: use of disjunctions between sequences; disjointed cola; asyndetic flow;
 - suitability for: improvised speech, written texts (debates, drama) imitating speech and/or conceived to be performed orally.

The nature and the aim of performance influence its style. Just as dialogue and letter-writing differ in their nature, so must they diverge in sentence structure. Unlike dialogue, a letter is not by nature an imitation of extemporaneous speech and its characteristic modes of expression. Demetrius, however, does not say that the (a)- or the (b)-style should be confined exclusively to the types of performance to which they are suited. The (b)-style, for instance, can just as well appear in written texts conceived to be read, provided it is not used excessively. What is important is the *extent of usage* of connectives as major determinants of style. Demetrius argues (192) that a performance

appears in Aquila Rom., *De fig.* 18, ed. Halm, *Rhet. Lat. Min.* 27.12 ff. (Martin in fact follows Aquila's classification closely).

¹ The word λέξεις at 193 overlaps the semantic field of ἐρμηνεία at 12. This fluctuation has been variously explained by scholars. Aristotle had used λέξεις, and not ἐρμηνεία.

² On asyndeton in ancient rhetoric cf. Barabino 1967, 37-38; Calboli 1969, 370-372 (with further bibl.); J. Martin 1974, 299-300. Significantly, it was called διάλυσις or (*dis*)*solutum* by some rhetoricians.

³ Bibliography on the relationship between drama and oratory in ancient rhetoric will be found in Calboli Montefusco 1979, 476.

which consists of *wholly* loose and disjointed sequences is obscure (τὸ δὲ ἀσύνδετον καὶ διαλελυμένον ὅλον ἀσαφὲς πᾶν), because in such cases disjunction renders the beginnings of cola unclear: ἄδηλος γὰρ ἡ ἐκάστου κώλου ἀρχὴ διὰ τὴν λύσιν, where ἐκάστου seems to corroborate the conclusion that Demetrius is thinking of a period made up of more than one colon,¹ and of a λύσις which marks off the beginning of *each* one of the two or more cola of which τὸ ἀσύνδετον καὶ διαλελυμένον ὅλον is composed. In other words, what is being objected to is not the λύσις as such, but the excessive use of λύσεις in a particular written context.

Elsewhere, Demetrius used the varying ratio of asyndetic versus periodic style as a criterion for distinguishing between three types of period construction (εἴδη or γένη περιόδων), each of which is deemed characteristic of a literary genre (19-21).² The dialogic period (21) is the loosest and the simplest of all because in it the cola are (usually) juxtaposed (ἐπέρριπται γὰρ ἀλλήλοις τὰ κῶλα ἐφ' ἐτέρῳ ἑτέρῳ) in the same way as units of utterance in disarticulated speeches (ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς διαλελυμένοις λόγοις). According to Demetrius, the dialogic period should in fact be phrased by means of a homogeneous mixture of (a)- and (b)-styles: δεῖ γὰρ μεταξὺ διηρημένης τε καὶ κατεστραμμένης λέξεως τὴν διαλογικὴν περίοδον γράφεσθαι, καὶ μεμιγμένην ὁμοίαν ἀμφοτέροις. This μεσότης statement³ seems prescriptive in nature. The verb γράφεσθαι suggests that it was directed specifically at written performance. Perhaps Demetrius takes for granted the existence of stylistic differences between oral dialogue and its written imitation. The target of his concern is the right proportion of loosely-juxtaposed versus periodically-constructed sequences.

It is now evident that, according to Demetrius, letters differ from dialogue not in that they are exempt from asyndeton, but in the fact that they avoid a *high* proportion of such disarticulated sequences (cf. 226 λύσεις συχναί). A *frequent* or *consistent* use of disjunctions and asyndeta (cf. 192 τὸ δὲ ἀσύνδετον καὶ διαλελυμένον ὅλον) is unsuitable for letter-writing as it is for any written performance conceived to be read, no matter how simple its style. Yet a mild use of asyndeton would not be inappropriate. What is at stake is the clarity (σαφήνεια) of the message (192, 226). Letters that avoid a pervasive use of asyndeton will be clear, whereas those that do not

¹ Note that Demetrius argued that a period may be composed of two or more cola (16-17; cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.9. 1409 b 13-17), or of a single colon (17; cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.9. 1409 b 16-17; Schenkeveld 1964, 28). On the monocolon period and the issues it raises see Fowler 1982, 94 n. 22; cf. also Dover 1997, 37.

² On this theory cf. Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1980, 65-72; Chiron 1993, xli, lxxi-lxxii.

³ Cf. Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1980, 69.

will be obscure. It is clear that a letter requires stylistic care. Demetrius states the principle that the style of letters must be *somewhat* more studied than that of dialogue: δεῖ γὰρ ὑποκατασκευάσθαι πῶς μᾶλλον τοῦ διαλόγου τὴν ἐπιστολήν (224). The use of non-asyndetic constructions in a letter should be slightly more frequent than in dialogue, but definitely less pervasive than in oratory. At 229, Demetrius prescribes that the structure of a sentence (σύνταξις)¹ in a letter should be looser (λελύσθω μᾶλλον) than in forensic oratory.² In his opinion, the plain style in general must avoid well-rounded unities made up of dependent constructions, and must use, rather, more straightforward and clearer combinations of independent clauses (198, 202). Long cola are equally inappropriate (204). Thus, in a letter, an effort must be made to avoid the excessive use not only of artlessly-juxtaposed sentences but also of over-complex periods. Combinations of comparatively simple periods by means of conjunctions and particles (σύνδεσμοι) seem to have been deemed acceptable.

The differences between letter-writing and dialogue as distinct types of performance which aim to conform to the same style are set out schematically in Table 1. Demetrius thus appears to have established five major principles. (i) Speech and writing diverge.³ Even though a plain style is used in both, the latter requires slightly greater refinement: written language is not a faithful record of living speech. (ii) In particular, a letter must be more refined than informal conversation, precisely because it is a form of written performance. (iii) Repeated use of asyndeton is tolerable in speech, but should be avoided in written communication, including letters. (iv) The extent of usage of periodic style and the degree of complexity of periods are criteria for distinguishing between types of written performance. (v) Period construction is a major target for stylistic concern in compositions which aim at simplicity.

2.1.1.3. The choice and the arrangement of words must also aim at simplicity and clarity. Simple terms are deemed appropriate for a letter (231).⁴ As Demetrius points out at 190-191, the plain style itself requires the use of everyday

¹ I follow most editors (including Rhys Roberts and Chiron) in accepting the reading συντάξει (P²M, *teste* Chiron). The variant reading τάξει (P¹, accepted by Radermacher [BT, 1901]) would shift the focus of 229 onto word order (cf. 139, 199-200), but the term περιοδεύειν shows that the matter under discussion is in fact sentence structure. Chiron 1993, 174 s.v. is probably right in taking σύνταξις as equivalent to σύνθεσις. For the use of highly periodic sentence structure in oratory see esp. *De eloc.* 20.

² Syntactically, λελύσθω μᾶλλον is used absolutely with an elative nuance, but it refers logically to δίκην γράφοντα ('rather loose compared with [or in contrast to] oratory'). Therefore, this prescription does not entail a contradiction with the recommendations advanced at 224, 226.

³ Before Demetrius, a distinction between speech and writing had been drawn by Arist. *Rhet.* 3.9. 1413 b 3 ff.

⁴ The term ὀνόματα means 'vocabulary', not 'language' (so Grube 1961, 113).

Chapter Two

vocabulary (συνήθης λέξις), actual meanings (κυρία λέξις),¹ and simple^{terms} as lexical tools which allow performance to acquire clarity.² By contrast, unusual words, metaphorical expressions, and compounds are regarded as features of the 'grand' (μεγαλοπρεπής) style,³ since their use produces stylistic majesty (ὄγκος) (77).

TABLE 1. *The Style of Dialogue and Letter-Writing in Demetrius' On Style*

Refinement degrees in the articulation of sequences within a period				
	hi.as.	b -	b +	hi.pe.
written		x		
<i>Dialogue:</i>				
spoken	x			
<i>Letter-writing:</i>				
			x	

hi.as. = highly asyndetic b = balanced ratio of asyndeta : connected sequences (b-/b+ = different degrees of refinement within a generally balanced ratio) hi.pe. = highly periodic.

In the plain style, word order must not be artificial, but natural.⁴ Freedom of choice between equivalent orderings of words is allowed at the beginning of the sentence (200-201), provided one remains faithful to φύσις (200) and avoids solutions which lead to obscurity (201). It is easy to infer that Demetrius is once more connecting artificiality with obscurity, on the one hand, and artless and natural style with clarity on the other. Writers who want to use a simple style are thus only free to choose between alternative types of word order which belong to natural and informal language. By contrast, the need for clarity requires avoidance of artificial orderings. Though not

¹ Rhys Roberts and Grube translate 'current diction'.

² On these features as indications of clarity cf. 192 (clarity lies ἐν τοῖς κυρίοις) and esp. 77 (ἡ δὲ κυρία καὶ συνήθης (scil. λέξις) σαφὴς μὲν αἰεί). Cf. J. Martin 1974, 250-251; esp. Calboli 1969, 303-305 and Calboli Montefusco 1979, 441-443, who provide thorough discussions of and much bibliography on the various meanings assigned to κύρια ὀνόματα = *verba propria* in ancient rhetoric. The fact that κυρία λέξις is clearly contrasted with τὸ μετενηγμένον ('words used metaphorically') at *De eloc.* 190 shows that Demetrius is thinking of *verba propria*.

³ For a more detailed discussion see 77, 78 ff. (metaphors), 91 ff. (compounds).

⁴ 199 καὶ ὅλως τῇ φυσικῇ τάξει τῶν ὀνομάτων χρηστέον.

explicitly directed at letter-writing, these prescriptions are presumably applicable to the epistolary style, since they aim to promote the use of clarity and simplicity.

2.1.1.4. Demetrius does not discuss figures of speech in the section which deals with the epistolary style; he does, however, in relation to the plain style. He prescribes that figures of speech that aim to impress readers because of their singularity (σημειώδη σχήματα)¹ should be banished from the plain style (208). By contrast, figures of speech that prevent ambiguity such as epanalepsis are considered not only acceptable but even desirable (196). In my view, these opinions can also be applied to letter-writing. In both cases clarity, which represents the recognised goal of the epistolary style (§ 2.1.1.1), is used as a criterion for accepting and rejecting figures.

2.1.1.5. It is hard to tell which features of elegance Demetrius allowed in a letter. Both his definition and discussion of the elegant style (128-189) display much confusion in terminology and thought.² The term χάρις, which Demetrius employs to indicate the elements of elegance inherent in the epistolary style (235), is used to denote both 'charming grace' and 'gracious wit' in the chapter on the elegant style (cf. 128). But all witticisms are included under the latter definition so that examples of stylistically widely-divergent prose compositions are classified together.³ Demetrius, however, mentions at least 'friendly advice' (φιλοφρονήσεις) and proverbs as features contributing to the enhancement of epistolary beauty (κάλλος) (232); and beauty is, in its turn, viewed as an element of the elegant and charming style (cf. 164, 173-174). Even according to later epistolary theorists, proverbs enhance charm (cf. § 2.1.4).

2.1.2. Evidence for the early Greek perception of the epistolary style is also supplied by *Τύποι ἐπιστολικοί*, a manual of letter-writing which is transmitted by some Medieval manuscripts under the false name of Demetrius of Phalerum.⁴ According to the compiler of this handbook (hereafter 'Pseudo-Demetrius'), a letter ought to be written ὡς τεχνικώτατα, a norm which is allegedly ignored by clerks employed in contemporary official chanceries, who are said to write letters 'as it happens',

¹ I follow the current interpretation of the expression σημειώδη σχήματα. For a slightly different interpretation see Grube 1961, 142, who translates 'figures packed with meaning'.

² Cf. Grube 1961, 30-32; Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1980, 90 ff.; Chiron 1993, lxxxviii ff.

³ Cf. Grube 1961, 31-32.

⁴ Edition: Weichert 1910, 1-12. English translation: Malherbe 1988, 30-41. The manual was certainly written in Egypt, see § 3.1 below. Its real authorship is unknown, and the date of composition uncertain. Scholars have argued (i) for a date between 200 BC and AD 50, cf. Brinkmann 1909, followed by Weichert 1910, xix-xx; Olsson 1925, 8; Sykutris 1931, 190.64 ff.; (ii) for a date between 200 BC and AD 300, cf. Keyes 1935, 28-30 and Koskenniemi 1956, 55. In my opinion, a date within the Ptolemaic period is far more probable.

'haphazardly' (ὥς ἔτυχεν).¹ Individuals must follow the compositional rules of art (τέχνη) in epistolary usage.² It must be emphasised, however, that while being aware of the need for stylistic care, Pseudo-Demetrius does not advocate the use of a high-flown style. Pseudo-Libanius, who echoed the present passage at the beginning of his manual of letter-writing, made the same point, even more clearly (cf. § 2.1.5). Unfortunately, Pseudo-Demetrius does not explain what an 'artistically'-motivated stylistic choice should comprise, or how to achieve the required level of 'artistic' respectability. He just provides the reader with a variety of *formae epistularum* from which he is evidently expected to draw his own inferences about the various modes of epistolary composition. It is important to emphasise that the specific target of Pseudo-Demetrius' concern was the epistolary practice of clerks entrusted with the task of writing official correspondence in public administration. The handbook itself was conceived as a guide to good epistolary usage for a certain Heracleides, who had a prominent position in contemporary society (1.14 Weichert), possibly as a high-ranking clerk in charge of official correspondence in public administration.³

2.1.3. More interesting remarks on the epistolary style are later found in Philostratus (ii/iii AD). The relevant sources are: (i) a short essay on letter-writing (II 257.29 - 258.28 Kayser), which is almost certainly a letter (or an excerpt from a letter) to Aspasia of Ravenna, written when Aspasia was employed as *ab epistulis* and conceived as a guide to good epistolary usage;⁴ (ii) two passages from the *Lives of the Sophists*, in which Philostratus assesses the style of imperial letters composed by the sophists Aelius Antipater and Aspasia when they were in charge of the bureau of *ab*

¹ Τύπ. ἐπ. 1.2-7 Weichert τῶν ἐπιστολικῶν τύπων . . . καθηκόντων μὲν ὥς τεχνικώτατα γράφεσθαι, γραφομένων δ' ὥς ἔτυχεν ὑπὸ τῶν τὰς τοιαύτας τοῖς ἐπὶ πραγμάτων ταττομένοις ὑπουργίας ἀναδεχομένων.

² ὥς τεχνικώτατα properly means 'as respectfully of (the requirements of) art as possible'. Malherbe (1988, 31) translates 'as skillfully as possible'.

³ Cf. Malherbe 1988, 7. Pseudo-Demetrius contrasts his approved attitude to epistolary composition with the customary usage of 'those who undertake such services (i.e., the composition of letters) for men in public office' (τῶν τὰς τοιαύτας τοῖς ἐπὶ πραγμάτων ταττομένοις ὑπουργίας ἀναδεχομένων) (Τύπ. ἐπ. 1.7 Weichert), and specifies that friendly letters can also be written by high-ranking officials when addressing equals and inferiors (Τύπ. ἐπ. 2.7 Weichert). These remarks would be pointless if Heracleides were not viewed as a prominent official secretary.

⁴ Cf. Philostr. *Vitae soph.* 2.33.3, II 126.19-21 Kayser; K. Münscher, *Die Philostrate* (*Philologus* Suppl.-band 10, Leipzig 1907) 510-512, 536; Weichert 1910, xi; A.R. Benner - F.H. Fobes, *The Letters of Alciphron, Aelian and Philostratus* (Loeb Cl. Lib. 383, Cambridge [Mass.] - London 1949) 389; Koskenniemi 1956, 20 n. 3. On the date of Aspasia's secretaryship cf. Ch. III § 1.3.5 (iii). On Philostratus' views on the epistolary style see Münscher, *Die Philostrate* 511; Koskenniemi 1956, 29-30; Thraede 1970, 23 n. 30.

epistulis,¹ in the passage dedicated to Aspasius' style, literary criticism is combined with proper advice on how to write imperial correspondence. The views presented in these three passages, partly in the form of prescriptions, partly in the form of assessments of actual performances, are remarkably consistent. It is important to emphasise that the target of Philostratus' concern was primarily the official correspondence which imperial secretaries had to compose on behalf of the emperors.² But as we shall see, there is reason to believe that his views on the style of other types of letter were substantially similar.

Philostratus, like Demetrius (§ 2.1.1.1), regards clarity and simplicity very highly. Described in general as 'a good guide for a letter',³ clarity is believed in particular to favour the understanding of law and, therefore, to be a necessary requisite for imperial correspondence, which is by nature concerned with legal cases.⁴ Obscurity is said to be 'inappropriate to an emperor'.⁵ Philostratus uses the term *πρέπον* (= Latin *decorum*, *aptum*), which was of paramount importance in ancient stylistics, since it was regarded as a fundamental *virtus elocutionis* which regulates the correct adaptation of form to content.⁶ Philostratus thus seems to argue on a distinct rhetorical level. In his opinion, clarity enables epistolary discourse to achieve stylistic perfection. This accounts for its use as a criterion of assessment of performance: imperial letters written by Antipater are praised for being clear, whereas those composed by Aspasius are blamed for being obscure.⁷ Ambition (*φιλοτιμία*) is rejected as 'puerility' (II 258.13-14 Kayser). Evidently, Philostratus regards unpretentious style as most suitable for letter-writing.

A fairly simple sentence construction is recommended. The use of periods is deemed 'too rhetorically impressive (*ἀγωνιστικώτερον*) for a letter' and, therefore,

¹ *Vit. Soph.* 2.24.1, II 109.3-13 and 2.33.3, II 126.19-27 Kayser, respectively.

² I cannot agree with those scholars (Sykutris 1931, 190.24-25; Hunger 1978b, 199) who have defined Philostratus' essay as an 'introduction to literary letter-writing'. Cf. also § 2.1.7 (G).

³ σαφήνεια δὲ ἀγαθὴ μὲν ἡγεμὼν ἅπαντος λόγου, μάλιστα δὲ ἐπιστολῆς (II 258.21-23 Kayser). On clarity as a feature of the plain style in Demetrius' *On Style* cf. § 2.1.1.1.

⁴ Cf. *Vit. soph.* 2.33.3, II 126.23-27 Kayser αὐτοκράτωρ γὰρ δὴ ὅποτε ἐπιστέλλοι, . . . οὐδ' αὖ ἀσαφείας (δεῖ), ἐπειδὴ νόμους φθέγγεται, σαφήνεια δὲ ἑρμηνεὺς νόμου.

⁵ *Vit. soph.* 2.33.3, II 126.23 Kayser.

⁶ Importance of *πρέπον*: e.g. *Dion. Hal. Lys.* 9, I 16.17-19 Us.-Rad. *πρέπον* . . . κρατίστην ἀπασῶν ἀρετὴν καὶ τελειοτάτην. In general, on the notion of *πρέπον* in ancient rhetoric see Calboli Montefusco 1979, 445-446. Cf. also J. Martin 1974, 251.

⁷ Antipater: *Vit. soph.* 2.24.1, II 109.10-11 Kayser. Aspasius: *Vit. soph.* 2.33.3, II 126.22-23 Kayser.

unacceptable (II 258.17-19 Kayser). Aspasia's letters are criticised in the *Lives of the Sophists* precisely for being either 'more impressive than is necessary' or 'unclear'.¹ By contrast, asyndeton is described as a stylistic tool which 'enhances the brilliance of a letter'.² Antipater is praised for using it. However, Philostratus concedes (ζυγχωρῶ) that writers can use periods exceptionally, for example in rather short letters or at the end of the composition (II 258.14-15, 19-21 Kayser). The views of Demetrius and Philostratus on period construction diverge. Philostratus seems to have regarded asyndetic sequences more highly than Demetrius (§ 2.1.1.2). Moreover, while Demetrius seems to have regarded the degree of period complexity as a determinant of the acceptance of periodic sentence structure in a letter (§ 2.1.1.2), Philostratus appears to have attached greater importance to the overall length of the letter and the planned location of the period within it.

Figures of speech as features of ambitious style are deemed unfitting for a letter as much by Philostratus as by Demetrius.³ As regards the strategies of argument, Philostratus condemns the use in imperial correspondence of rhetorical syllogisms such as ἐνθυμήματα and ἐπιχειρήματα.⁴

An important innovation in Philostratus' essay in relation both to Demetrius' *On Style* and Pseudo-Demetrius' *Epistolary Types* is the presence of prescriptions regarding language selection. 'The form of letters', we are told, 'must appear more Attic than current language, but more current than Atticism': δεῖ γὰρ φαίνεσθαι τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τὴν ἰδέαν ἄττικωτέραν μὲν συνηθείας, συνηθεστέραν δὲ ἄττικίσεως (II 258.8-10 Kayser). Philostratus clearly recommends adopting a mildly Atticising language. In spite of some difficulties in the use of terminology he seems to prescribe that the linguistic form of a letter (ἰδέα) should be composed of a mixture of Atticist features (ἄττικίσις) and elements characteristic of current usage (συνήθεια) so that its puristic profile appears more relaxed than strongly Atticising performances, but

¹ Philostr. *Vitae soph.* 2.33.3, II 126.21-23 Kayser ἐπιστολὰς τὰς μὲν ἀγωνιστικώτερον τοῦ δέοντος ἐπέστελλε, τὰς δὲ οὐ σαφῶς.

² *Vit. soph.* 2.24.1, II 109.12-13 Kayser τὸ ἀσύνδετον, ὃ δὴ μάλιστα ἐπιστολὴν λαμπρύνει.

³ Philostr. II 258.11-13 Kayser ἐχέτω δὲ τὸ εὖσχημον ἐν τῷ μὴ ἐσχηματίζεσθαι, εἰ γὰρ σχηματιοῦμεν, φιλοτιμεῖσθαι δόξομεν. The verb σχηματίζω has the technical sense 'use figures' (σχήματα), cf. LSJ s.v. II 6, and does not mean 'make covert allusions' (so Malherbe 1988, 43). On Demetrius' views on the use of figures of speech in letters see § 2.1.1.4.

⁴ *Vit. soph.* 2.33.3, II 126.23-25 Kayser αὐτοκράτωρ γὰρ δὴ ὅποτε ἐπιστέλλοι, οὐ δεῖ ἐνθυμημάτων οὐδ' ἐπιχειρημάτων. In general, on the ancient doctrines of syllogism, ἐνθύμημα, and ἐπιχείρημα see J. Martin 1974, 102-106. On ἐνθύμημα in particular see Calboli Montefusco 1979, 415-416 (with further bibl.). On ἐπιχείρημα see W. Kroll, *Das Epicheirema* (SAWW 216.2, Vienna-Leipzig 1936); Calboli Montefusco 1979, 417-420.

more Atticist than wholly casual performances.¹ Philostratus thus seems to promote μεσότης as the guiding rule for language selection.

In fact, in the verbatim quotation of this passage by Pseudo-Libanius' *Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτήρες*, Philostratus is cited as also saying that the language of a letter should be 'neither too elevated nor exceedingly humble, but middle'.² These words are not found in Philostratus' text in the editions by Kayser. Although the rest of the quotation displays banalisations in word order and vocabulary, they can hardly have been the product of Pseudo-Libanius' mind: the chiasmus *λίαν ὑψηλὴν ~ ταπεινὴν ἄγαν* is consistent with Philostratus' style. A *saute du même au même* would easily account for the omission in Philostratus' text, as follows: δεῖ γὰρ φαίνεσθαι τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τὴν ἰδέαν ἀττικωτέραν μὲν συνηθείας, συνηθεστέραν δὲ ἀττικίσεως καὶ < μήτε λίαν ὑψηλὴν μήτε ταπεινὴν ἄγαν, ἀλλὰ μέσῃν τινά, καὶ > συγκεῖσθαι μὲν πολιτικῶς, τοῦ δὲ ἄβροῦ μὴ ἀπάδειν.

The excessive use not only of Atticist features but also of colloquial items is regarded as a deviation from the appropriate epistolary style.³ The adoption of a moderately Atticising language complies with the requirements of *πρέπον*. In Philostratus' theory of the epistolary style, *aptum* seems to allow greater relaxation in the construction of period than in the choice of language. Writers are expected to avoid a high degree of artificiality in style, but must also refrain from carelessness in language selection. Although an imperial letter is viewed as distinct from formal written discourse, individuals who are entrusted with the task of composing imperial correspondence are required to aim at a moderate level of purism.

Philostratus tells us the names of other writers besides Antipater whose letters are regarded as models of good epistolary usage (II 258.1-6 Kayser). The emperor

¹ It seems natural to take *ἰδέα* to designate a linguistic form: note the *v.l.* φράσις in a quotation of the present passage by [Liban.] *Ἐπιστ. χαρακτ.* 47, p. 33.15 Foerster-Richtsteig. By contrast, the term *συνήθεια* was normally used to denote a language variety (see esp. Siebenborn 1976, 90-92; Versteegh 1986, 260-264). The same seems true of *ἀττίκισις*, to judge from its commoner synonym *ἀττικισμός*, which occurs as a *v.l.* for *ἀττίκισις* in that quotation by Pseudo-Libanius (33.17 Foerster-Richtsteig). *συνήθεια* and *ἀττίκισις* are thus distinct varieties within a single diasystem. But a letter represents the performance of a socio-communicative function, in which language varieties are employed side-by-side in a certain proportion (cf. Ch. III § 1). The form of a letter is thus the result of the interaction of different varieties. The relationship between linguistic form and language variety is akin to that between a whole and a part: in both situations, neither item can compare with the other. My paraphrase above assumes a looser connotation of *συνήθεια* and *ἀττίκισις*. *συνήθεια*, for instance, is taken to designate 'a kind of informal utterance for which the everyday, non-puristic language variety is reserved'.

² [Liban.] *Ἐπιστ. χαρακτ.* 47, p. 33.17-34.1 Foerster-Richtsteig δεῖ γὰρ τὴν τῆς ἐπιστολῆς φράσιν τῆς μὲν συνηθείας ἀττικωτέραν εἶναι, τοῦ δὲ ἀττικισμοῦ συνηθεστέραν καὶ μήτε λίαν ὑψηλὴν μήτε ταπεινὴν ἄγαν, ἀλλὰ μέσῃν τινά.

³ Cf. II 258.6-8 Kayser ὑπεραττικίζων δὲ καὶ ὑπερλαλῶν ἐκπίπτει (*scil.* Ἡρώδης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος) πολλαχοῦ τοῦ πρέποντος ἐπιστολῇ χαρακτῆρος.

Marcus Aurelius is in the list. Whether he was praised specifically for letters written in fulfilment of his imperial duties we do not know, but certainly none of the other writers is known to have composed imperial correspondence. As the list occurs in the essay addressed to Aspasius, the authors included may have been regarded as valuable guides to good usage even for imperial secretaries. There is an evident connection between the list and the subsequent theoretical remarks, since the prescriptions on language selection originate from partial criticism of the language of one of the authors who were proposed as models. It seems, therefore, that Philostratus included in his 'canon of epistolographers' writers who conformed to the same theoretical principles as those proposed in his essay. In his opinion, rules which govern style selection in letter-writing do not vary in relation to the type of letter. One thus wonders whether *all* his suggested regulations concerning imperial correspondence, including the proscription of ἐνθυμήματα and ἐπιχειρήματα, were deemed applicable to other types of letter.

2.1.4. Over one and a half centuries later, probably between AD 384 and 390, Gregory of Nazianzus conceived one of his letters to Nicobulus as a concise theoretical essay on the epistolary style.¹ His views are largely traditional. Clarity (*ep.* 51.4) and charm (*ep.* 51.5) are regarded as the principal goals of a letter and as determinants of style selection. In the wake of opinions expressed by Demetrius in *On Style*, charm is deemed achievable by means of a moderate use of short moral sentences (γνῶμαι), proverbs (παροιμίας), apophthegms (ἀποφθέγματα), jests (σκώμματα), and riddles (αἰνίγματα).² On the other hand, Gregory recommends that, in order to achieve clarity, writers should (a) refrain from τὸ λογοειδές as far as possible (φεύγοντα τὸ λογοειδές, ὅσον ἐνδέχεται) and (b) rather incline to colloquial utterance (μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ λαλικὸν ἀποκλίνειν).³ This prescription raises crucial questions.

(a) Does Gregory condemn

(i) written prose style in general, irrespective of genre,⁴

or (ii) the elaborate prose style of oratorical speeches (λόγοι) ?⁵

(b) Does he speak of the need for an 'inclination' towards informal speech, and not

¹ *Ep.* 51, ed. Gallay, GCS, pp. 47-48. In fact, two individuals called Nicobulus are attested (*PLRE* I 629-630 s.vv. 'Nicobulus 1' and 'Nicobulus 2'). For the hypothesis that *ep.* 51 is addressed to Nicobulus II and not to his father Nicobulus I, and that it was written sometime between AD 384-390, see P. Gallay, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres*, I (Budé, 1964) 126; Id., *Gregor von Nazianz. Briefe* (GCS, Berlin 1969) xix.

² *Ep.* 51.5, ed. Gallay, GCS, pp. 47.24-48.4. For Demetrius' views on such matters see § 2.1.1.5.

³ Cf. *ep.* 51.4, ed. Gallay, GCS, p. 47.19-20.

⁴ So Malherbe 1988, 59 ('prose-like'). For τὸ λογοειδές = 'prose' cf. LSJ s.v. [I].

⁵ So apparently Gallay in his Budé edition ('discourse en forme').

of the need for a faithful imitation of it

- (i) because of an *ideological* dislike for the use of an exceedingly informal and careless style in letters,
- or (ii) out of *pragmatic* conviction that written language cannot of necessity conform in full to spoken language?

A positive answer to (a i) is incompatible with a positive answer to (b i). And I regard (a ii) + (b ii) as unlikely. We are thus left with two possibilities, which entail divergent interpretations of Gregory's words:

- A. (a i) + (b ii): while being aware of the impossibility of fully achieving a colloquial style in written performance, Gregory would nevertheless advise writers to strive for it in letters;
- B. (a ii) + (b i): Gregory would definitely prescribe a happy medium between the very elaborate and the exceedingly artless styles.

Gregory specifies that the model of epistolary perfection (αὕτη τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀρίστη καὶ κάλλιστα ἔχουσα) is represented by the letter which is able to persuade not only the uneducated (τὸν ἰδιώτην) but also the educated (τὸν πεπαιδευμένον), 'appearing to the former as written on the popular level, and to the latter as above that level'.¹ These words support hypothesis B above. We are not told, however, which features of informal speech writers should 'incline' to reproduce in their letters. What we do learn is that the need to refrain from oratory means avoiding rhetorical devices which make compositions markedly artistic. Gregory condemns the use of Gorgian figures such as ἀντίθετον (a sequence composed of reciprocally contrasting cola), πάρισον (a sequence composed of no less than two almost equally long cola), and ἰσόκωλον (a sequence composed of no less than two equally long cola).² He admits their use in a letter under particular circumstances.³ A few centuries earlier, Demetrius regarded the same figures

¹ Cf. *ep.* 51.4, ed. Gallay, GCS, p. 47.20 ff. The translation given here is that of Malherbe (1988, 59).

² *Ep.* 51.6, ed. Gallay, GCS, p. 48.6-8. The meanings of these figures as given by ancient rhetoricians vary in many respects, see Barabino 1967, 15-18; Calboli 1969, 318-319 (ἀντίθετον), 336-338 (ἰσόκωλον and like figures); J. Martin 1974, 293-295 (ἀντίθετον), 310 (πάρισον and ἰσόκωλον). As Barabino (1967, 18 n. 29) has pointed out, Aquila Rom. *De fig.* 23-24 (ed. Halm, *Rhet. Lat. Min.* 30.5-21) seems to have been the only rhetorician to draw a distinction between πάρισον and ἰσόκωλον (cf. also Calboli 1969, 338). Gregory's classification may thus reflect this doctrine. Note that the order of figures in his letter resembles the sequence of topics discussed by Aquila in *De fig.* 22-24 (ἀντίθετον (22), ἰσόκωλον (23), πάρισον (24)). In my discussion above, I have followed Aquila's definitions; Gallay's translation (Budé, p. 67) seems correct. For a different interpretation see Weichert 1910, xvi.

³ *Ep.* 51.6, ed. Gallay, GCS, p. 48.7-8 εἰ δέ που καὶ παραλάβομεν, ὥς καταπαίζοντες μᾶλλον

as stylistic devices which contribute to the enhancement of the grand style (*De eloc.* 29) but damage the simplicity of 'ethical' composition (*De eloc.* 28). This suggests that he proscribed the use of Gorgian figures in epistolary correspondence, the style of which had to be both simple (§ 2.1.1.1) and respectful to the character (ἡθος) of the writer (*De eloc.* 227). Gregory thus appears to have shared these deep-rooted beliefs, although his limited concession to the use of those figures is unparalleled in previous theorists.

2.1.5. Traditional views on the epistolary style are also found in the preface to a collection of model letters contained in an early Byzantine manual of letter-writing, which is preserved in numerous Medieval manuscripts under the false names of Libanius and Proclus ('Pseudo-Libanius' in this thesis).¹ The compiler even cited or paraphrased passages from authoritative theorists, normally without explicit acknowledgement of the quoted author. Three aspects of his theory deserve particular consideration.

A. According to Pseudo-Libanius, letters should be composed 'neither loosely (ἀπλῶς) nor haphazardly (ὥς ἔτυχεν), but with much precision (ἀκριβείᾳ) and art (τέχνη).'² This sentence contains two contrasting pairs of words. The first word of the first pair contrasts with the first word of the second pair, whereas the second word of the first pair contrasts with the second word of the second pair. In both couples, one word establishes the kind of compositional behaviour deemed unacceptable, while the other emphasises the recommended principle of conduct, as follows:

(a) ἀπλῶς ~ σὺν ἀκριβείᾳ;

(b) ὥς ἔτυχεν ~ σὺν τέχνη.

Pseudo-Libanius did not proscribe the use of a simple style but carelessness; the adverb ἀπλῶς is used in a negative sense.³ Couple (b) seems to echo a prescription found in Pseudo-Demetrius' *Epistolary Types* (cf. § 2.1.2).⁴

τοῦτο ποιήσομεν ἢ σουδάζοντες.

¹ Edd. Weichert 1910, 21 ff.; R. Foerster - E. Richtsteig, *Libanii opera*, IX (Leipzig 1927) 27-47. English translation: Malherbe 1988, 66-81. The date of compilation of the genuine parts of the handbook has been variously set between the fourth and the sixth century, see Koskenniemi 1956, 56 n. 2. For information on the 'spurious recension' see Luiselli 1997, 649 n. 21. Foerster-Richtsteig preferred the Libanius recension. For a contribution in favour of the Proclus recension see J. Sykutris, *ByzJ* 7 (1928-1929) 108-118 (cf. Sykutris 1931, 191.3 ff.), whose arguments have been accepted by Koskenniemi 1956, 56 (with n. 1) and Hunger 1978b, 200. Bibliography on the manuscript tradition: Luiselli 1997, 646 n. 10, 649 n. 21.

² [Lib.] *Ἐπιστ. χαρ.* 1, p. 27.3-5 Foerster-Richtsteig.

³ For ἀπλῶς = 'loosely' cf. LSJ s.v. II 4. Malherbe 1988, 67 translates 'artlessly'.

⁴ This echo allows the revision of the belief that the manual of Pseudo-Demetrius was unknown to Pseudo-Libanius. Förster, for instance, wrote in the preface to his edition of

Pseudo-Demetrius 1.2 ff. Weichert:

τῶν ἐπιστολικῶν τύπων . . .
καθηκόντων μὲν ὡς τεχνικώτατα
γράφεσθαι, γραφομένων δ' ὡς ἔτυχεν
κτλ.

Pseudo-Libanius 1 p. 27.3-5 Foe.-Rich.:

τῷ γράφειν βουλομένῳ προσήκει μὴ
ἀπλῶς μηδ' ὡς ἔτυχεν ἐπιστέλλειν,
ἀλλὰ σὺν ἀκριβείᾳ πολλῇ καὶ τέχνῃ.

Pseudo-Libanius recommends that writers carefully (σὺν ἀκριβείᾳ) comply with the rules of art (τέχνῃ). These are discussed at § 46 (p. 33.7 ff. Foerster-Richtsteig), where careful epistolary composition (note ἀκριβῶς) is said to consist in not only attention to modes of treating subject-matter (ὑποθέσεως μεθόδῳ) but also in the use of a moderate degree of stylistic refinement. An excessively artificial style is deemed inappropriate (cf. (B) below).¹

B. Writers are advised to adorn their letters with stylistic embellishments (φράσεως ἀρετῇ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν κατακοσμεῖν),² including archaising diction.³ A mild degree of purism and linguistic elegance is deemed necessary.⁴ Not only an excessively lofty and verbose style but also hyper-Atticising language are regarded as alien to the epistolary style.⁵ Pseudo-Libanius adduces 'all the ancients' (πάντες οἱ παλαιοί) and particularly Philostratus (cf. § 2.4) as authorities for his views (47, p. 33.13 ff. Foe.-Rich.).

C. Clarity (σαφήνεια) is regarded as a necessary adornment and 'a good guide' for a letter (48, p. 34.1-5 Foe.-Rich.); Philostratus' statement (II 258.21 ff. Kayser; cf. § 2.1.3) is cited verbatim, though anonymously.

2.1.6. Supplementary evidence comes from statements by writers who describe their own letters or express judgements on the style of letters written by their correspondents. These sources seem to confirm that stylistic care was regarded as a necessary ingredient of epistolary composition. Failure to devote due attention to style called for self-defence. In a letter addressed to the rhetor Evagrius, Julian makes an advance admission of careless conduct and offers an excuse for any errors he might

Pseudo-Libanius' manual (p. 1): '(libellus Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτῆρες) non quidem Demetrii τύπων ἐπιστολικῶν . . . cognitionem prodit'.

¹ Therefore, I cannot agree with Malherbe, who translates τέχνῃ as 'skill' (1988, 67).

² Ἐπιστ. χαρακτ. 46, p. 33.9 Foerster-Richtsteig.

³ Ἐπιστ. χαρακτ. 48, p. 34.1-3 Foerster-Richtsteig κοσμεῖν δὲ δεῖ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν . . . ἀρχαϊσμῶ λέξεων.

⁴ Ἐπιστ. χαρακτ. 46, p. 33.7-11 Foerster-Richtsteig δεῖ δὲ τὸν ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστέλλειν ἐθέλοντα . . . ἀττικίζειν μὲν μετρίως, μὴ μέντοι πέρα τοῦ προσήκοντος κομψολογία χρησθαι.

⁵ Ἐπιστ. χαρακτ. 47, p. 33.11-13 Foerster-Richtsteig ἡ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον ὑψηγορία καὶ τὸ ταύτης ὑπέρογκον καὶ τὸ ὑπεραττικίζειν ἀλλότριον τοῦ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν καθέστηκε χαρακτῆρος.

make: τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐπισύρων πρὸς λύχνον γέγραφα, ὥστε, εἴ τι ἡμάρτηται, μὴ πικρῶς ἐξέταζε, μηδὲ ὡς ῥήτωρ ῥήτορα (*ep.* 4.428 b, p. 14.8-9 Bidez).

Not surprisingly, language was targeted for stylistic concern. But while theorists proscribed the use of an excessively elevated language in letter-writing, actual epistolary practice did not always conform to theory. According to Philostratus, for instance, the rhetor Herodes the Athenian occasionally used a strongly puristic language in his letters (II 258. 6-7 Kayser). Their loss regrettably prevents us not only from studying the characteristics of a recognised example of highly Atticising epistolary prose, but also from examining to what extent the chosen degree of puristic intensity could be correlated with subject-matter. Later sources confirm the existence of favourable attitudes towards purism in letter-writing. Basil of Caesarea showed great admiration for the Atticist form of a letter written by Libanius, although he claimed to be both incapable and unwilling to rival his correspondent's performance.¹ In the early fifth century, Firmus of Caesarea enthusiastically praised a letter of Flavius Anthemius Isidorus for its puristic and carefully-chosen language.² This letter was apparently dispatched to communicate an episcopal election, but we do not know whether Isidorus limited himself to a simple report or dignified the practical content of the letter with philosophical thoughts.³ The reason why he practised puristic self-censorship in that particular circumstance escapes us.

Certain writers had a favourable attitude even towards highly refined style. According to Philostratus, the style of imperial correspondence composed by the sophist Aspasius of Ravenna was highly oratorical at times (§ 2.4). Even more interesting evidence is found in a Byzantine letter which Dioscorus of Aphroditto (c. AD 520-585) included in his files, possibly as a model letter (P.Cair.Masp. III 67295 'page III' 23-35).⁴ Neither the name of the addressee nor that of the sender were transcribed; the latter was substituted with the heading 'f(rom) so-and-so *notar(ius)*'. At lines 24-26, the writer expresses great pleasure in the δεινότης ῥητορική of his correspondent's letter: τὰ

¹ Basil. Caes. *ep.* 356 Courtonne (= [Liban. et Basil.] *Comm. epist.* 22, XI 595.7-9 Foerster) ἀπαιτούμενοις δὲ (*scil.* ἡμῖν) πρὸς ᾧ γράφεις (*scil.* Libanius) ἀντεπιστέλλειν ἄγών. τί γὰρ ἂν εἴπομεν πρὸς οὕτως ἀττικίζουσιν γλῶσσιν, πλὴν ὅτι ἀλιέων εἰμὶ μαθητής, ὁμολογῶ καὶ φιλῶ.

² Firm. Caes. *ep.* 30, ed. Calvet-Sébasti/Gatier, SChr 350, p. 138.7-10 οὐδὲ εἰπεῖν ἔχω ὅσον ἦσθην τῇ ἐπιστολῇ. μύρου τε γὰρ ὅζει παιδεύσεως ἀττικῆς καὶ λειμῶνος μιμεῖται κάλλος, ἥρος ὥρα σύμμικτον χάριν ταῖς ὅψεσιν ὑπογράφοντος. On this image see Calvet-Sébasti / Gatier, *Firmus de Césarée. Lettres* (SChr 350, Paris 1989) 139-140 n. 4. The letter may have been written before AD 435, see Calvet-Sébasti / Gatier, *Firmus* 58.

³ For papyrus examples of this practice see Ch. IV.

⁴ The papyrus was penned by Dioscorus himself, see J.-L. Fournet, *REG* 105 (1992) 232. On this letter see esp. Karlsson 1959, 85-88. On Dioscorus see Ch. III § 2.2.4.

προσκυνούμενα γράμματα τῆς σῆς ἐνδιαθέτου φιλίας | κομισάμενο[ς] ἥσθην οὐ σμικρῶς ἐ[πὶ] τῇ ἐνπεριεχομένῃ [l. ἐμπερ-] αὐτοῖς | δεινότητι ῥη[τ]ορικῇ. The notion of δεινότης became fashionable in post-classical Greek stylistics, not only because it was awarded a central position in theoretical systematisations of style, but also because it was used in literary criticism. Unsurprisingly, its meaning varies.¹ It is thus difficult to establish the exact meaning in this case: the writer does not provide a clue to his intentions, and the loss of his correspondent's letter prevents us from forming an idea about its style. In theory, δεινότης ῥητορική may have been used to denote either 'oratorical forcefulness' or 'rhetorical skill' in general.² The former possibility involves a stylistic judgement that is incongruous with the deep-rooted belief that δεινότης 'forcefulness' is the outcome of inappropriate stylistic choices for epistolary correspondence. In *On Style*, for instance, Demetrius drew a distinction between the plain style, of which the epistolary style represents a specific application, and the forceful style.³ However, admiration for rhetorical skill would also be remarkable in that theorists generally proscribed the use of rhetorical embellishments in letter-writing (§ 2.1.7 (E)).⁴

The value of this source is threefold. It testifies to the survival of oratorically-oriented epistolary performances down to the Byzantine period, to an enthusiastic reception of this unconventional stylistic practice, and to the specific presence of such an attitude in Egypt.⁵ Unfortunately, we know virtually nothing about the sender and the addressee of the letter. The heading tells us only that the individual who greatly appreciated the epistolary use of rhetorical style was a *notarius*. But *notarii*

¹ Cf. in general I. Voigt, *δεινότης. Ein antiker Stilbegriff* (Leipzig 1934); J. Martin 1974, 337-338, 344-345. Select contributions focusing on individual authors: Demetrius, *On Style*: G. Morpurgo-Tagliabue, *RAAN* n.s., 54 (1979) 281-318; Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1980, (esp.) 106-119; Chiron 1993, xcvi-cvii; Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Kindstrand 1982, 33-34 (with further bibliography at p. 33 n. 68); Hermogenes: Hagedorn 1964, 34-37; Kindstrand 1982, 54-55.

² So Karlsson 1959, 84 ('habilité rhétorique'). Dionysius of Halicarnassus is a notable example of a critic who used the term δεινός in either sense, cf. Kindstrand 1982, 33.

³ For a list of divergences and analogies between the forceful and the plain styles see Morpurgo-Tagliabue 1980, 106 and 107, respectively. Their elements of affinity such as the avoidance of Gorgian figures (*De eloc.* 27-28) are of little or no significance.

⁴ Incidentally, it may be noted that the writer of the Cairo papyrus letter says that he is not acquainted with rhetorical (?) 'norms' (νόμοι): 'page III' 26-27 πρὸς ἣν (scil. the δεινότης of his correspondent's letter) οὐδὲ [ἀ]πολογίας εὐπορεῖν δεδύνημαι διὰ τὴν ἐμὴν περὶ τοῦ νόμου ἀμάθειαν.

⁵ I assume, of course, that either the sender or the addressee or both of them were from Egypt.

Chapter Two

with varying duties were employed in imperial, ecclesiastical, and private posts.¹ Where the person in question was employed and with what duties (if indeed he was in a position of effective responsibility²) we do not know, nor can we tell whether he was an influential intellectual in contemporary Egypt.

Conclusion

2.1.7. To summarise the above discussion, the following points can be highlighted:

(A) Avoidance of Carelessness

Greek theorists generally agreed that carelessness should be avoided in epistolary composition. According to Pseudo-Demetrius and Pseudo-Libanius, writers ought to comply with the rules of art (§§ 2.1.2, 2.1.5). Demetrius and probably also Gregory of Nazianzus recommended aiming at slightly greater stylistic refinement in letters than in colloquial speech (§§ 2.1.1.2, 2.1.4). Philostratus and Pseudo-Libanius were averse to the excessive use of current language (see (F) below). Similar attitudes are also found in several late antique practitioners of letter-writing (§ 2.1.6). Artemon's preference for colloquial utterance (§ 2.1.1.2) seems to have been an isolated viewpoint. By contrast, the Romans appear to have set great value on conversational style.³

(B) Degrees of Stylistic Refinement

As letter-writing was regarded as a different genre from oratory, epistolary theorists generally proscribed the adoption of a highly refined style. They disagreed on the detail (see (C), (E) below). On the other hand, there is evidence of more favourable attitudes towards the use of a highly rhetorical style and an elevated language outside the circle of theorists (§ 2.1.6; cf. (E), (F) below).

(C) Period Construction

Views on period construction diverged slightly. Demetrius recommended using simple periods in preference to asyndetic sequences (§ 2.1.1.2), whereas Philostratus seems to have preferred the latter (§ 2.1.3).

¹ Cf. H.C. Teitler, *Notarii and Exceptores. An Inquiry into Role and Significance of Shorthand Writers in the Imperial and Ecclesiastical Bureaucracy of the Roman Empire (from the Early Principate to c. 450 A.D.)* (Amsterdam 1985).

² For example, Flavius Julianus, a resident of Alexandria, was a *clarissimus tribunus* and *notarius sacri palatii* in AD 494-500, see P.Oxy. LXIII 4394.12-19: the editor (J. Rea) suggested plausibly that his post was a sinecure (*ed.pr.* p. 128; on the provenance of the papyrus see *ibid.* p. 115).

³ Cf. Weichert 1910, xiii. But the late rhetorical treatise preserved by the MS Par. lat. 7530 opposes not only archaic words but also vulgar terms, see *Exc. rhet.* 589. 22-23 Halm, *Rhet. Lat. Min.* (*verba simplicia, verum minime antiqua nec tamen vulgaria ac sordida*).

Chapter Two

(D) Word Order

Artificial orderings of words were criticised by Demetrius (§ 2.1.1.3). No prescriptions on word order are found in other sources.

(E) Rhetorical Embellishments

Rhetorical devices were generally considered unfitting for a letter. Figures of speech contributing to the enhancement of the rhetorical elegance of composition, particularly Gorgian figures, were proscribed not only by Demetrius (§ 2.1.1.4) but also by Philostratus (§ 2.1.3) and Gregory of Nazianzus (§ 2.1.4). The latter, however, conceded that writers could use figures in particular circumstances. Outbursts of enthusiasm for letters characterised by rhetorical embellishments, or even by the use of an oratorical style, are found outside the circle of theorists (§ 2.1.6; cf. (B) above).

(F) Language Selection

Before the spread of linguistic Atticism, Demetrius recommended a simple vocabulary comprising current words, non-metaphorical lexical meanings, and non-compound terms (§ 2.1.1.3). Views on language selection changed in the course of time under the influence of Atticism. Philostratus in the late second/early third century and Pseudo-Libanius in the early Byzantine period recommended a moderately puristic profile (§§ 2.1.3, 2.1.5). They represent two extremes of a continuous line of tradition, since favourable attitudes to the epistolary use of linguistic purism and choice vocabulary are found in other late antique writers, including Christians (§ 2.1.6). Ancient theorists seem to have been aware of the 'non-stagnation' of registers (Ch. I § 2.2.2). Unfortunately, we do not know whether attitudes towards metaphorical meanings and compound words also changed in the course of centuries.

(G) The Target of Prescriptions

There is no evidence that the ancients ever drew a distinction between 'literary' and 'non-literary' letters, as is customary in modern times. In fact, both the recommendations of Pseudo-Demetrius and the Atticistically-oriented prescriptions of a sophist such as Philostratus were deliberately addressed at clerks and secretaries employed in official chanceries. While Pseudo-Demetrius seems to have aimed at high-ranking secretaries of the Ptolemaic administration (§ 2.1.2), Philostratus was concerned with the Roman imperial chancery (§ 2.1.3). On the other hand, Gregory of Nazianzus may have been concerned with private letters. The modern notion of 'private literary epistolography' seems to have no foundation in ancient rhetoric.

2.2. THEORIES OF STYLISTIC VARIATION

2.2.1. The ancients were aware that a variety of factors can influence epistolary composition, and that, therefore, the style of letters is subject to variations. Through a conflation of highly varied sources dating from different periods, it is possible to construct an abstract model to classify factors which were viewed in antiquity as major determinants of stylistic variations in letter-writing. Epistolary composition was considered to depend on:

(I) the sender (Theon, *Progymn.* 10, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 115.22-24; Nicol. *Progymn.* 67.3-5 Felten) and particularly his ἦθος (so both Theon and Nicholas of Myra), since writers were expected to communicate their own personalities in their correspondence.¹

(II) the recipient (Demetr. *De eloc.* 234; Theon, *Progymn.* 10, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 115.22-24; Nicol. *Progymn.* 67.3-5 Felten; Iul. Vict. *Ars. rhet.* 105.35-106.1 Giomini-Celentano; *Exc. rhet.* 589.4-8, 25-28 Halm, *Rhet. Lat. Min.*; P.Berol. inv. 21190 [= P.Berl.Lit. 94] [vi AD].² Many later Byzantine manuals of letter-writing aim primarily at instructing people how to accommodate a letter to the recipient³), that is to say, upon whether one is writing to:

(i) a group of people such as a town council (cf. Demetrius, *De eloc.* 234),
or (ii) a single individual. In this case, writers were expected to take account of:

- (1) his character (ἦθος), cf. Theon, *Progymn.* 10, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 115.24; Nicholas of Myra, *Progymn.* 67.3-5 Felten (cf. no. 8);
- (2) his origin (*genus*), cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.6 Halm;
- (3) his sex (*sexus*), cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.6 Halm;
- (4) his age (ἡλικία, *aetas*), cf. Theon, *Progymn.* 10, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 115.24; *Exc. rhet.* 589.6 Halm;

¹ Cf. Demetr. *De eloc.* 227. For the widespread belief that a letter is a 'mirror of the soul' see esp. W.G. Müller, 'Der Brief als Spiegel der Seele. Zur Geschichte eines Topos der Epistolartheorie von der Antike bis zum Samuel Richardson', *A & A* 26 (1980) 138-157. Recipients greatly appreciated letters written in a personal language, cf. Basil. Caes. *ep.* 19.1-3 Courtonne (γράμμα ἦλθέ μοι πρόην παρὰ σοῦ, ἀκριβῶς σὸν . . . τῷ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἰδιώματι).

² Cf. Luiselli 1997, 647-648, 651.

³ See Luiselli 1997, 648-649. Cf. also the *Ἐπιστολαὶ τεχνικάι*, MS Par. gr. 2782 A, fols. 215^r ff. (Weichert 1910, lxiii-lxiv; Rabe 1909, 299 n. 2), which provides significant information, because the text seems to be a version of Pseudo-Libanius' *Epistolary Styles*.

Chapter Two

- (5) his education (*instructio*), cf. Julius Victor, *Ars rhet.* 105.36 Giom.-Cel.; *Exc. rhet.* 589.6 Halm;
 - (6) his profession (*ars*), cf. P.Berol. inv. 21190 (= P.Berl.Lit. 94), fr. 1+2, side ↓, ll. 9-15; *Exc. rhet.* 589.6 Halm;
 - (7) his public function (*officium*), cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.6 Halm;
 - (8) his morals (*mores*), cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.6 Halm (cf. no. 1);
 - (9) his mental disposition (*affectus*), cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.6 Halm;
 - (10) his reputation (*nomen*), cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.7 Halm;
 - (11) his rank (*dignitas*), cf. Demetrius, *De eloc.* 234; Julius Victor, *Ars rhet.* 105.35-36 Giom.-Cel.; *Exc. rhet.* 589.7 Halm;
 - (12) his familiarity with the sender (Julius Victor, *Ars rhet.* 105.36-106.1 Giom.-Cel.), in terms of
 - (a) relationship by blood
 - or (b) friendship, cf. P.Berol. inv. 21190 (= P.Berl.Lit. 94), fr. 1+2, side ↓, ll. 2-6, ed. Luiselli 1997, 644-645).
- (III) the circumstances (τὸ παρόν or καιρός, cf. [Dem. Phal.] *Tύπ. ἐπ.* 1.4 Weichert and Theon, *Progymn.* 10, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 115.25, respectively), among which are to be considered
- (i) subject-matter (ὑλὴ, cf. Theon, *Progymn.* 10, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 115.25-27) and particularly
 - (1) whether the letter deals with official or private matters, cf. Cic. *Pro Flacc.* 37; Iul. Vict. *Ars rhet.* 105.11 Giom.-Cel.; *Exc. rhet.* 589.9, 28 Halm;
 - (2) whether the letter deals with holy or profane matters, cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.9-10, 28-29 Halm;
 - (3) whether the letter deals with the sender's personal affairs or with matters which do not relate to him, cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.10 Halm;
 - (4) whether the letter deals with a prominent subject or with a modest one, cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.10 Halm;

Chapter Two

(5) the particular topic, cf. P.Bon. 5 (= GB 16 = CEL 1¹) (iii/iv AD),²
Firm. Caes. ep. 39, ed. Calvet-Sébasti/Gatier, SChr 350, p. 158.1-4.

(ii) the logic of the particular social code which links the sender with the recipient: cf. the countless typological variations discussed and exemplified in Pseudo-Demetrius' *Epistolary Types*, P.Bon. 5, Pseudo-Libanius' *Epistolary Styles*, as well as in numerous Greek epistolographic manuals preserved by Medieval codices.³ Pseudo-Demetrius offers twenty-one epistolary types, but acknowledges that his list could well be supplemented in the course of time (2.9-10 Weichert). Forty-one types occur in the genuine parts of Pseudo-Libanius' handbook. Later manuals and collections display further types,⁴ some of which turn up occasionally in ancient sources outside the known epistolographic handbooks.

(iii) the setting (τόπος), cf. Theon, *Progymn.* 10, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 115.25.

Although this model is an abstraction, it seems representative of the ancient perception of the mechanisms that regulate epistolary composition. It seems that no dramatic change in the course of centuries affected the ancients' views on this matter, since sources dating from different periods agree on individual points. They diverge from one another in variously emphasising certain factors in preference to others, but that depends on their specific scope and character. The minute categorisation of the determinants of stylistic variation as displayed by Julius Victor and especially by the so-called *Excerpta rhetorica* seems to reflect their interest in theoretical systematisation. Theon's *Progymnasmata* points in the same direction.⁵ On the other hand, handbooks do not aim to provide accurate classifications; their purpose is to give practical advice on exemplary situations. One needs to remember that the form of a

¹ Pack² 2117; CPL 279; Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* Suppl. 1677. English translation: Malherbe 1988, 44-57. Commentaries: GB pp. 109-123; CEL II pp. 3-7.

² Cf. most recently Luiselli 1997, 647.

³ For information on these manuals see esp. Rabe 1909, 298-300; Weichert 1910, lxii-lxvii; one of them is cited at p. 105 n. 3 above. On the 'spurious recension' of Pseudo-Libanius' *Epistolary Styles* see p. 99 n. 1 above. On the notion of 'epistolary type' (τόπος) as a mode of expression determined by the logic of the relationship between the sender and the recipient in a particular situation see especially Stowers 1986, 51-57; cf. also Reed 1997, 174.

⁴ Cf. e.g. Tomadakis 1969-1970, 55-57.

⁵ Celentano (1994, 434) suggested that Julius Victor's classification was influenced by *progymnasmata*.

letter is, and was in antiquity recognised to be, the outcome of an interaction of different factors. The task of illustrating how these interrelate in actual usage is different from that of listing them at a theoretical level. The former inevitably involves a process of selection from a wide range of possible combinations of factors and leaves many of them unconsidered.

In general, ancient manuals aimed to focus only on variations determined by one of the three major factors listed above. They offer evidence, however, that there was an awareness of complementary differentiations caused by interaction with other factors. P.Bon. 5 contains several examples of congratulatory letters on reception of an inheritance.¹ It represents an attempt to illustrate how to accommodate the form of letters to a particular epistolary type (cf. III ii above) and to a specific subject (cf. III i 5 above). The compiler of the handbook preserved by P.Berol. inv. 21190 (= P.Berl.Lit. 94) offers instructions on how to write a letter to a friend in response to a gift.² Such a letter is expected to take account not only of the recipient (ll. 2-4³) but also of subject-matter (l. 6) and possibly of the type (ll. 2 ?, 6 ?).

For the possibility that the type was mentioned in the heading cf. Luiselli 1997, 644, appar. crit. on l. 2 (note that in many later manuals both the recipient and the epistolary type of models are specified in their headings, cf. e.g. Luiselli 1997, 649 n. 20, 650). Line 6 may refer either (i) to the epistolary type and to subject-matter, or (ii) to the latter only. (i) is possible only if my restoration $\delta\phi\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\varsigma$ is accepted. It also requires taking $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha\iota$ to mean 'letter' (cf. the translation given in Luiselli 1997, 645), as in SB IV 7438.5 = *N.Pap.Prim.* 78 (c. AD 551) and in later Byzantine epistolography (cf. e.g. J. Darrouzès, *Épistoliers byzantins du X^e siècle* [Arch. de l'Or. Chr. 6, Paris 1960] 421-422). The term $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha\iota$ was usually employed to designate an official letter (so in SB 7438 and elsewhere), but not exclusively so (*pace* Darrouzès, *Épistoliers* 428). For $\chi\rho\alpha\nu\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha\iota\varsigma$ 'write letters' cf. P.Kell. G. I 63.13-14 (iv AD), P.Oxy. XVI 1829.17 (vi AD), Niceph. Ur. ep. 23.4 Darrouzès (*Épistoliers* p. 228). On the other hand, (ii) is possible irrespective of whether $\delta\phi\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\varsigma$ is correct. But in that case $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\alpha\iota$ must be taken to mean 'expressions', 'words' as in the late antique exx. cited by A. Carlini, in R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di B. Gentili*, III (Rome 1993) 1148 n. 17.

¹ P.Bon. 5 cols. v/vi 12 - xi/xii = *GB* 16.65-168 = *CEL* 1 cols. iii (+ iii bis) 12 - vi (+ vi bis).

² P.Berol. inv. 21190 (= P.Berl.Lit. 94), fr. 1+2, side ↓, ll. 2-6, ed. Luiselli 1997, 644-645.

³ At l. 3, I still prefer Maehler's supplement $\delta\ \tau\upsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\nu$ (cf. Luiselli 1997, 644 appar. crit.), since it suits traces, space, sense, context, and the general character of the handbook. G. Ioannidou (*P.Berl.Lit.* p. 125) restored $\delta\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. $\pi\lambda$ is a possible reading, and the supplement $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\hat{\omega}\nu\ \gamma\rho\lambda\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ would suit the spacing. But there are two arguments against it. (i) Line 3 would mean 'if the ty[pe of the l]etter has been counted among th[e . . .]'. Among what? I can think only of $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\iota\tau\iota\varsigma\ \phi\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$ (*vel sim.*), but that would point to an unparalleled classification of epistolary types into groups and subgroups. (ii) In this manual, models aim to give instructions on how to accommodate the form of a letter to the recipient: the epistolary type, if present (see below), is of secondary importance.

Chapter Two

The same attitude is found in later manuals. The collection of model letters preserved by the late fifteenth-century MS Vat. gr. 1753, fols. 37^r-60^v seems particularly significant.¹ The following set of examples are instructive:

MODEL	RECIPIENT	TYPE	OCCASION
1. (fol. 43 ^v)	friend	apologetic	the recipient is away
2. (fol. 38 ^{r-v})	"	supplicatory	outburst of affliction in the sender
3. (fol. 57 ^v)	"	reproachful	unfriendly behaviour of recipient
4. (fols. 54 ^v -55 ^r)	"	jesting ?	failure of recipient to change enmity for friendship
5. (fol. 55 ^{r-v})	"	" ?	lies of recipient
6. (fols. 55 ^v -56 ^r)	"	" ?	failure of recipient to comply with orders
7. (fol. 57 ^r)	"	?	donation of a small gift

NB. Models have been tabulated irrespective of their order in the manuscript.

Letters addressed to the same recipient may differ in epistolary type. The recipient and the epistolary type being equal, variations caused by the occasion of the letter emerge.

2.2.2. Which compositional aspects do these factors affect ? According to ancient theorists, writers were required to focus their attention primarily on the general tone of their correspondence. Epistolographic manuals aimed specifically to illustrate tonal variations. In the West, Julius Victor provides succinct instructions on how to adjust the tone according to recipients,² and the compiler of the rhetorical treatise transmitted by the MS Par. lat. 7530 sets out detailed advice on how to modulate the tone in relation not only to recipients but also to subject-matter.³ Evidence of ancient views on variations of a specifically stylistic and linguistic nature is slender. Recommendations found in theoretical sources are generally spare and sweeping.

¹ For an accurate description of the collection see P.Canart, *Codices Vaticani Graeci. Codices 1745-1962*, I (1970) 39-42. Cf. Luiselli 1997, 649 with n. 20.

² Cf. Iul. Vict. *Ars rhet.* 105.35-106.1 Giomini-Celentano. On the prohibitory character of these prescriptions see Celentano 1994, 434.

³ Cf. *Exc. rhet.* 589.25-31 Halm, *Rhet. Lat. Min.*

Demetrius, for instance, recommends raising the style when addressing rulers and cities (*De eloc.* 234), but does not explain how this process of refinement should take place. Taking his accepted standard of stylistic refinement (§§ 2.1.1.1-2.1.1.5) as a parameter, I suspect that he meant the adoption of more elaborate sentence structure and of stylistic ingredients such as artificial orderings of words, unusual and metaphorical vocabulary, and figures of speech. Similar thoughts are found in Julius Victor, who recommends adopting a more elevated style in official letters than in private correspondence. He explicitly consents to the use in *epistolae negotiales* of choice words, rhetorical figures, and oratorical prescriptions in general (*omnia oratoria praecepta*).¹

Practical handbooks are generally uninformative about variations of a stylistic and linguistic nature, nor can reliable inferences be drawn from the models provided. Interesting information, however, is supplied by a model letter contained in the manual P.Berol. 21190 (= P.Berl.Lit. 94), fr. 1+2, side →, ll. 1-8. Although the exact sense of ll. 6-8 is obscured by a wide gap, it seems that the writer is asking that information on the state of health and life style (of his recipients ?) be communicated to him in a 'uniformly-written' letter (σφτηρίαν κ(αί) | διαγωγὴν μο[νοτρ]όπῳ τῷ γραμμ[α-
τι) so that he may be relieved (ὅπως ἄθλιπτο[ς] συνάξω τὸν νοῦν).² The term μονότροπος seems to have a stylistic connotation. Dionysius of Halicarnassus distinguished a style (λέξις) which is μονότροπος from a style which is ποικίλη and μεμιγμένη.³ In the present case, it seems inevitable to take μονότροπος as having a positive connotation and to designate a uniform style as opposed to a multiform utterance; a negative sense such as 'monotonous' is unlikely. The writer appears to have correlated a particular style with a particular subject.

¹ Cf. Iul. Vict. *Ars rhet.* 105.12-18 Giomini-Celentano.

² Transcript and supplements are my own. The phrase συνάγω τὸν νοῦν 'recall one's mind', 'recollect oneself' is found in late literary Greek, see Philox. *ep.* 27, ed. Mai, *Nova bibl. patrum* 8.1 (1871) 176; cf. Lampe s.v. συνάγω C 2 (Ioannidou's φυλάξω cannot be read). I regard ἄθλιπτο[ς] as more satisfactory than ἀθλίπτω[ς] and ἄθλιπτο[ν] (so Ioannidou).] . σοφώτατοι (not -τάτοις) may be a vocative or an addition to the vocative ('(you), the most wise, let me know about your state of health'): παλγσοφώτατοι is a possible supplement (] . is the top of an upright).

³ Cf. Dion. Hal. *Ars rhet.* 1.1.7-8 (VI 260.1-4 Usener-Radermacher).

3. ACQUAINTANCE WITH RHETORICAL THEORIES OF LETTER-WRITING IN EGYPT

3.1. The existence of an interest in epistolary theory in Egypt is documented by three of the extant ancient epistolographic handbooks. The manual of Pseudo-Demetrius seems to have been compiled in Egypt.¹ P. Bon. 5 and P. Berol. inv. 21190 (= P. Berl. Lit. 94) were unearthed there: the exact provenance of the former is unknown, whereas the latter comes from Hermopolis. The readership and the aim of the manual of Pseudo-Demetrius are clear. The compiler aimed to offer instructions in letter-writing to a certain Heracleides, who was apparently to be entrusted with the task of writing official correspondence in public administration (§ 2.1.2). We do not know, however, whether the handbook enjoyed circulation among a wider audience than its intended readership, or whether it exerted an influence on actual epistolary practice. By unknown routes, the manual came to Pseudo-Libanius' notice (§ 2.1.5) and survived down to the Middle Ages.²

On the other hand, the readership and the extent of circulation of the two papyrus handbooks are unclear. The apparent absence of echoes in later manuals does not necessarily mean that they were not widely read in antiquity, but nothing suggests that they circulated widely in contemporary Egypt. We do not even know whether the papyri are autograph compilations or copies. Nor can their ownership and utilisation be determined with confidence. In my opinion, the Bologna papyrus is not the exercise of a student,³ since its formal, practised script suggests a mature writer, perhaps a professional scribe. The papyrus may still have been used by a teacher for school instruction,⁴ but this possibility cannot be verified. In fact, such a bilingual handbook might also have been used for self-instruction in, or as general reference for, letter-writing in a foreign language. Originally, the Berlin codex must have been a big book⁵ to be kept on a shelf. What kind of person housed it in his library we cannot tell. The epistolary precepts provided in the manual are very varied and, therefore, may have been of interest to a wide range of individuals. The tenor of instructions at fr. 1+2, side

¹ Cf. Brinkmann 1909, 311-312.

² For information on the MSS see Weichert 1910, xxxvi ff.

³ Pace Stowers 1986, 33.

⁴ So Malherbe 1988, 6.

⁵ On its format see Luiselli 1997, 644 n. 3.

↓, ll. 9-15 suggests that the handbook was not intended for high-ranking officials.¹ The handbook was perhaps conceived as a work of reference for the common people.

3.2. Theon and Nicholas of Myra show that preliminary acquaintance with norms which regulated stylistic variations in letters could be gained during the period of study devoted to the preparatory rhetorical exercises (*progymnasmata*). Letter-writing was regarded as a form of discourse which enabled children to master skills in personal characterisation or *prosopopoeia*.² There is evidence to show that rhetorical *progymnasmata*, including sets of exercises described by Theon and Nicholas, were adopted in schools of Roman and Byzantine Egypt.³ It is thus possible that advanced students in the Egyptian *chora* were also required to take exercises in letter-writing in order to develop facility in adopting various kinds of style. How many pupils continued their studies up to this educational stage after being taught the rudiments of writing, is hard to tell. Yet only a highly developed acquaintance with rhetoric could have led to awareness of theories of the epistolary style such as those advanced by Demetrius, Philostratus, and Gregory of Nazianzus. A small minority of the literate population is likely to have achieved this.

¹ This section aims to instruct readers how to write a letter to a *scriniarius*. The formal style (cf. the consistent use of the 2nd person plural as a sign of respect, and the respectful farewell formula at l. 15 ἔρρω(σο) δέσποτα) suggests that the recipient is viewed as a respectable official. On *scriniarii* see M. Gelzer, *APF* 5 (1913) 350-351; R. Grosse, *Klio* 15 (1918) 144-145; Seeck, *RE* II A (1921) 893.52-904.57 (esp. 894.6-895.11) s.v. 'scrinium'; G. Rouillard, *L'Administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine* 2nd ed. (Paris 1928) 93-94.

² Theon, *Progymn.* 10, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II 115.20 ff., Nicol. *Progymn.* 66.16-67.5 Felten, see § 2.2.1 above. Cf. also G.A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton 1983) 70-71; Malherbe 1988, 7; Luiselli 1997, 650-651.

³ See § 1.3.1 above, where the use of traditional exercises in χρείας κλίσις in a Greek grammatical school from late Roman Upper Egypt is discussed. Cf. also Cribiore 1996, 52, who draws attention to an exercise in *ethopoia*.

CHAPTER THREE

THE USE OF SELECT HIGH LEVEL LANGUAGE VARIETIES IN THE NON-LITERARY PAPYRI FROM ROMAN AND BYZANTINE EGYPT

1. ἀρχαίως καὶ δοκίμως διαλέγεσθαι: THE USE OF ATTICIST PURISM

1. 1. INTRODUCTORY

1.1.1. Manuscript evidence suggests that many educated people in Roman and late Roman Egypt must have been acquainted with the puristic rules proposed by Atticism. The occurrence in a school-book from Upper Egypt of archaistically-oriented linguistic recommendations, the form of which recalls the characteristic structure of entries in Atticist lexica (Ch. II § 1.5), shows that individuals gained preliminary knowledge of puristic regulations during their years of study. Atticist lexica also circulated in the *chora*. The second-century fragmentary roll P. Lond. Lit. 183 contains remnants of one such lexicon, possibly ordered alphabetically if fr. 1 col. ii is representative of the whole manuscript.¹ Unfortunately, we know nothing about its provenance and findspot, let alone about its ownership.² Remnants of another puristic lexicon are apparently found in a small fragment (fr. 17) belonging to P. Oxy. VII 1012, a third-century papyrus which contains *inter alia* a treatise on literary composition datable to the first or second century AD.³

The layout suggests a lexicon rather than a full discussion, but the terminology poses remarkable problems. The terms ἀττικόν and ἑλληνισμός are apparently used in alternate lines and are supposedly set in mutual opposition, the latter denoting features of contemporary Greek (cf. Canfora 1995, 83). This hypothesis, however, entails three anomalies. (i) Linguistically, the use of ἑλληνισμός in place of ἑλληνικόν to denote an individual post-classical feature is surprising: the latter would be more natural and would agree with the complementary use of ἀττικόν to designate an Attic feature. (ii) The suggested evidence for ἑλληνισμός 'contemporary Greek' (Canfora 1995, 83) is both slender and of doubtful relevance, whereas the use of ἑλληνικόν in this sense would be acceptable (cf. the use of Ἑλληνες in Moeris' lexicon). (iii) The word ἑλληνισμός was normally employed to denote correct speech, particularly in the grammatical tradition.⁴ If this were an Atticist lexicon akin to that of Moeris, then ἑλληνισμός

¹ Pack² 2291. It is uncertain whether the text is a fuller version of Phrynichus' *Ecloga* as is transmitted by Med. MSS, or one other Atticist lexicon from which Phrynichus borrowed material. This important issue, briefly addressed in the *ed.pr.* (see Milne, *P. Lond. Lit.* [1927] p. 150), is a complex one and cannot be dealt with here. Unfortunately, the papyrus is not discussed in Fischer's recent edition of Phrynichus' *Ecloga* (Fischer 1974; at least ll. 33-42 should have been cited at p. 88, apparatus of *loci similes* to *Ecl.* 263) — a major fault which passed unnoticed by reviewers —, and has been neglected by students of Atticist lexica.

² No clue is suggested by the script and the general appearance of the copy.

³ Pack² 2289. For the date of the treatise see A.S. Hunt, *P.Oxy.* VII (1910) p. 83.

⁴ On ἑλληνισμός = correct speech and its criteria see esp. Steinthal 1891, II 361-363 (cf. II

would designate incorrect or non-puristic usage. This meaning seems unparalleled. The criteria of ἑλληνισμός included συνήθεια or *consuetudo*,¹ but no anomalistic orientation led to the compilation of lexica whose main purpose was to condemn Attic in favour of contemporary Greek. Even the so-called Antiatticist is not an anti-Attic lexicon proper, but aims to promote mild Atticism in opposition to strict Atticist lexicographers such as Phrynichus.²

P.Oxy. 1012 was found together with a number of literary papyri usually believed to be part of the private library of a third-century Oxyrhynchite scholar.³ Some of these are probably professional copies 'privately commissioned and written on paper supplied to the scribe by the person giving the commission'.⁴ P.Oxy. 1012 seems to be a copy of

121); Siebenborn 1976, 32-163; Bonner 1977, 198 ff. (who deals esp. with *latinitas*; on the evolution of this notion see also M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Emerita* 19 [1951] 34-40; Fr. Desbordes, in Said 1991, 33-47); Calboli Montefusco 1979, (esp.) 439-441; C. Dalimier, in Said 1991, 17-32; Schenkeveld 1994, 281-292; cf. also Mette 1952, 30-36, 45 ff., 62-64; Cavazza 1981, esp. 129-130, 137-138.

- ¹ See Mette 1952, 31-33 and esp. Siebenborn 1976, 90-92, 96-97.
- ² Cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5. Note that the Antiatticist has been regarded as a product of anomalistic attitudes (Reitzenstein 1897, 377 ff., but the question is controversial, see Cavazza 1981, 134 ff.).
- ³ List of manuscripts: Cockle 1987, 22 n. 14. For the hypothesis that they once belonged to a private library see Turner 1952, 90 & 1980, 76, followed by Cockle 1987, 22 and Krüger 1990, 196.
- ⁴ Turner 1980, 93, followed by Cockle 1987, 23 and apparently by Lama 1991, 110, although she also speaks of 'mercato librario', which is, of course, very different from private commission. *GMAW*² p. 16 speaks of 'a commercial publishing house', but there is no telling whether the scribes responsible for these manuscripts were employed in one and the same *scriptorium*. In fact, the same lot includes at least one professionally-produced manuscript which was not copied in the same *scriptorium* as the other papyri

this kind.¹ Other professionally-produced books, which supposedly belong to the same lot, however, were penned more than a century earlier. It is unclear how they came into possession of the owner of P.Oxy. 1012. Perhaps they were purchased or inherited.² Whether and to what extent his profession was an influential consideration in the selection of books for inclusion in his library cannot be known for certain. In any case, he must have had vast knowledge of classical Greek prose and poetry. P.Oxy. 1012 fr. 17 also suggests that he was aware of the importance which contemporary rhetoric attached to linguistic correctness in literary composition.³ There is regrettably no telling whether he wrote one or other of the third-century letters and petitions published so far. No opportunities are thus available to assess his non-literary prose style in the light of his wide literary culture and particularly of his background in rhetoric and puristic Greek.

Manuscripts also occur which contain glossaries of a genre cognate with the Atticist lexica. Attic diction, for example, seems to have been the principal, yet not the exclusive, subject of P.Oxy. XVII 2087 (ii AD) and P.Oxy. XV 1803 (vi AD).⁴ Most of the authorities cited are Attic prose and comedy writers. They also have glosses in common with Atticist lexica such as Phrynichus' *Sophist's Stock-in-Trade* and Moeris' lexicon (Naoumides 1969, 200), although they seem to depend on common sources.⁵ These manuscripts provide evidence of an interest in classical Attic vocabulary, but not in Atticist lexica proper, since the glossaries have no distinctively normative aim. P.Oxy. 1803 seems to be a professionally-produced book, whereas the script and the abbreviations employed in P.Oxy. 2087 suggest a privately-made copy of a scholar.

(see below).

- ¹ Unlike other papyri, it displays no stichometrical notation, but the text was copied on re-used paper in a carefully-written professional bookhand belonging to the so-called 'Severe Style'. On literary texts written on the back of documentary rolls see esp. Lama 1991.
- ² Cf. P.Oxy. V 844, an Isocrates papyrus (Pack² 1263; J. Lenaerts - P. Mertens, *CE* 64 [1989] 224 no. 1263) which is written by the same copyist as a Thucydides (P.Oxy. X 1246 = Pack² 1530; O. Bouquiaux-Simon - P. Mertens, *CE* 66 [1991] 207 no. 1530); see Krüger 1990, 193. Apparently the Thucydides papyrus was not unearthed together with the same lot as P.Oxy. 844. The script seems much earlier than the third century (early ii AD according to Grenfell and Hunt, or slightly earlier, see G.Cavallo, *ASNP* s.ii, 36 [1967] 214).
- ³ On the place of ἑλληνισμός/*latinitas* as a *virtus orationis* in rhetorical *elocutio* see J. Martin 1974, 249-250; Calboli Montefusco 1979, 435-441; Nicolai 1992, 202.
- ⁴ Pack² 2120, 2126, respectively. They were regarded by Naoumides (1969, 182 no. 7 and 183 no. 17) as lexica of Attic diction, but a gloss found in P.Oxy. 1803 (fol. 1^v, ll. 8-10) deals with the prosodic scansion of Σάραπις. This suggests that the glossary did not focus exclusively on Attic diction.
- ⁵ (i) The gloss P.Oxy. 1803.1-7 (fol. 1^v) is much fuller than Moer. 209.8 Bekk., since it also contains

Finally, one must take account of the fact that people could become acquainted with puristic prescriptions through commentaries and scholia to classical authors.

1.1.2. Common people employed puristic items in their own everyday prose; the extent of reception varied according to individuals and circumstances. Carlos Hernandez Lara has recently investigated the use of purism in papyri.¹ Unfortunately, I cannot agree either with his chosen criteria for selecting evidence, or with his methods of analysis, and therefore I must take issue with his conclusions. In this chapter, I shall attempt to assess the relevant evidence more carefully in accordance with the methodological principles outlined in Ch. I §§ 3.1-3.4. Moreover, as the allegedly puristic items do not carry the same value as documentary evidence for the practice of purism, the crucial issue is to single out a variety of significant features which may provide a solid basis for the research. I shall thus take into account features which Atticist lexicographers deemed to be puristic. Information provided by other sources (including scholia) will be considered only so far as it corroborates evidence supplied by those authors. Furthermore, as the puristic features listed in the extant Atticist lexica are not equally significant as markers of puristic intervention, I have defined two major criteria of significance by which I have selected the relevant items.

A. *Usage.* In relation to their diffusion in Koine prose, puristic features can be categorised in three different ways:

1. Out-of-fashion items which enjoyed very limited re-integration into the Greek linguistic system of the Roman period;
2. Out-of-fashion items which enjoyed a more extensive revival in this period;

quotations from Aristophanes (*PCG* III 2, fr. 134) and Menander (fr. 389 Körte). (ii) As regards P.Oxy. 2087, (a) the *interpretamenta* at l. 22 (ἐξαπαίωσαι Pap.: read ἐξᾶραι, <ὁψῶν>αι, see *LSJ Rev. Suppl.* 16 s.v. ἀκταίνω) are similar to Phryn. *Praep. soph.* 39.8-14 de Borr. (~ *Συν. λέξ. χρησ.*, ed. Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.* I 63.26-64.1 = Phot. *Lex.* α 873 Theodor.). The wrong reference to Plato's *Phaedo* as found in both glosses suggests an old corruption (see *ed.pr.*, *ad loc.*; Naoumides 1969, 198 n. 46), and discrepancies in minor textual details are consistent with a common source. (b) The affinity between l. 23 (κομψὸς γὰρ ὁ πανοῦργος) and Phryn. *Praep. soph.* 7.13 de Borr. (κομψὸν γὰρ τὸν πανοῦργον ~ *Συν. λέξ. χρησ.*, ed. Bachmann, *Anecd. Gr.* I 58.19 ~ (partly) Phot. *Lex.* α 791 Theodor.) seems certain (for the cognate gloss ἄκομψον: ἀπανοῦργον see Theodoridis' apparatus to Phot. *Lex.* α 791 and the remarks of R. Reitzenstein, *Der Anfang des Lexicons des Photios* [Berlin-Leipzig 1907] xli and Ch. Theodoridis, *Photii patriarchae Lexicon*, I [Berlin-New York] lxxiii n.6); a common source accounts for the discrepancies. In a third case (ll. 24-26 ~ *Praep. soph.* 23.13-24.2), the affinity is in doubt in spite of the occurrence of the same reference to Plato's *Laws* (747 d) in both glosses. An *interpretamentum* similar to that of the papyrus is given by *Schol. Plat. Lys.* 216 a, p. 121 Greene (note ἰδιότροπον. For the use of the nom. and acc. in lemmata see F.Bossi-R.Tosi, *BIFG* 5 [1979-1980] 9-10, 11-13; Tosi 1988, 120-121; one more ex. is (b) above).

¹ Hernandez Lara 1994, 142-219.

3. Items which had never gone out of fashion in previous centuries, but simply co-existed with their non-puristic variants in Koine of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

This categorisation points to the existence of a scale of puristic intensity within the wide range of linguistic features which the Atticists considered puristic. As modern linguistics have shown, the more assimilated an item is into the contemporary linguistic system, the more intense is the purism which seeks to remove it.¹ The same is true of the Greek used in the first centuries of the Christian era. The use of such unintegrated puristic features as no. 1 instead of well-established words presupposes a very high degree of puristic intensity. They can be regarded as good indicators of severe puristic intervention.

B. *Puristic recognition.* As extant Atticist lexica may offer divergent views on the puristic value of individual features (Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5), we need to distinguish

- (1) items accepted as puristic only by severe purists such as Phrynichus and Moeris

from (2) items considered puristic only by milder purists such as the Antiatticist and the compiler of *Philetaerus*.

Every B feature has an A connotation. In my opinion, only B 1 items which can also be defined as either A 1 or A 2 represent reliable indicators of puristic intervention. By contrast, no written performance enables the determination of whether the use of A 3 items, including those belonging to class B 1, was or was not puristically-motivated. Similarly, there is no telling whether attestations of B 2 items, whatever their A connotation, are to be taken as indicators of puristic or non-puristic conduct.²

§ 1.2 will explore the phenomenon of severe puristic intervention through an analysis of two significant test cases. It will thus focus on B 1 items that are characterised by an A 1 connotation. On the other hand, § 1.3 will investigate the overall puristic profile of entire performances. Consequently, I shall also take account of (a) more B 1/A 1 features, (b) B 1/A 2 items, (c) a number of A 1's which do not appear in the extant Atticist lexica. B 2 items will be directed to the reader's attention, but will be treated as doubtful evidence. Only items belonging to category A 3 will not be considered.

¹ G. Thomas 1991, 172.

² On this problem cf. also Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5.

1.2. ANALYSIS OF SELECT FEATURES

1.2.1. θᾶπτον / τάχιον¹

1.2.1.1. Atticist lexicographers of different puristic orientations recommended using the Attic form θᾶπτον in place of the later form τάχιον (Phryn. *Ecl.* 52 Fischer, [Herod.] *Philet.* 18 Dain, Moer. 210.17 Bekker). A certain Socrates of Mopsus, however, reportedly considered τάχιον less blameworthy than is βράδιον (Luc. *Soloec.* 7). From the late first century onwards, the choice between τάχιον and θᾶπτον in written usage seems to have been primarily a function of the degree of Atticising pretension of writers. τάχιον not only occurs regularly in the NT and the early Christian writings,² but was also used side by side with θᾶπτον in more refined literature prior to the full manifestation of linguistic Atticism (Dion. Hal., Plut., Dio Chrys., cf. Schmid I 86). By contrast, it was avoided by second- and third-century Atticising writers, both pagan and Christian.³ θᾶπτον was equally the preferential form in higher level literature in the late antique and Byzantine periods,⁴ although many writers did not avoid τάχιον altogether; a number of occurrences of this form are found even in Psellos (Böhlig 1956, 49 n. 6). Atticism seems to have also exerted an occasional

¹ Cf. Kühner-Blass I 556; Jannaris 1897, § 519^b; Schwyzer I 538 and 539 n. 4; Crönert 1903, 190; Lobeck 1820, 76-77; Pierson 1831, 321; Rutherford 1881, 150; Maidhof 1912, 325, 328. For ancient grammatical sources see Herod. II 383.17 Lentz; Eulog. *gl.* 6 Reitzenstein (1897, 352).

² Cf. Moulton-Howard 164. Apparently only two exx. of θᾶπτον occur, both outside the NT, see Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich 814 s.v. ταχέως 2 (with bibliography). In Clem. Rom. *ep. ad Cor.* 1.65.1, θᾶπτον is part of a literary construction, see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 61 n. 1. τάχιον, however, is found both in Clement's letter (in the same passage as θᾶπτον!) and in *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Cf. also Voelz 1984, 941.

³ For example, θᾶπτον was consistently used by Lucian (no less than 17x), Aelius Aristides (11x), Philostratus (9x in *Vita Apoll.* [Schmid IV 25; add 1.22, I 24.7 and 5.30, I 188.27 Kayser], 3x in *Vitae soph.*, 1x in *Heroic.*), and Clement of Alexandria, both in *Protr.* (10.110.3, I 78.19 Stählin, GCS) and in *Paed.* (7x). Occurrences of θᾶπτον in the novelists: 7x in Chariton (τάχιον only at 6.1.6; cf. Hernandez Lara 1994, 55), 5x in Longus (no ex. of τάχιον), 5x in Achilles Tatius (no ex. of τάχιον), 18x in Heliodorus (ταχίων at 1.15.4 Colonna). For rhetorical declamations circulating (and composed?) in Roman Egypt see e.g. *Encomium on the fig*, P.Oxy. XVII 2084.30 (iii AD) (on the language and style of this short piece see § 1.3.2 below).

⁴ On fourth- and fifth-century letter-writing cf. § 1.2.1.2.3 below. In later periods, θᾶπτον occurs in

Chapter Three

influence on the manuscript tradition of non-Atticising writings.¹

1.2.1.2. Non-literary papyri from Roman Egypt display a mere handful of cases of $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ versus many instances of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\nu$.² Hernandez Lara argued that the type of document was an influential consideration in deciding between the two variants,³ but a closer examination of the evidence available on each documentary genre reveals the existence of a greater variety of determinants of selection (§§ 1.2.1.2.1-1.2.1.2.3).

Imperial Constitutions

1.2.1.2.1. No example of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\nu$ occurs in Roman and late Roman imperial constitutions, whereas $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ is found in two letters. The earlier text is a letter from Antoninus Pius (?) (AD 138-161) to the Ephesians, of which two copies closely related to the original have survived (Oliver 1989 no. 160 A & B).⁴ $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ occurs twice (ll. 12 and 13 according to A's numbering). The two readings are probably genuine, since each of them is given by both copies. The later text is a letter from Severus Alexander (AD 222-235) to the *koinon* of Bithynia, which is preserved in three different copies: (i) *Dig.* 49.1.25 (its source is Paul's *Responsa*), (ii) P. Oxy. XVII 2104 (= Oliver 1989 no. 276 A), (iii) (partly) P. Oxy. XLIII 3106 (= Oliver 1989 no. 276 B), the latter being presumably an official copy.⁵ $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ is given by (i) and (ii), whereas in (iii) the relevant passage has been lost. The agreement between (i) and (ii) is of great import. The subscription of P.Oxy. 2104 tells us that the imperial letter was included in the *commentarii* of the prefect of Egypt.⁶ The papyrus, however, is not the official copy kept in the prefect's office, but a direct or indirect copy of that exemplar. This indicates that the papyrus is

the lives of saints written in high level Greek: cf. e.g. Usener 1907, 50.

- ¹ Cf. the occasional occurrences of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon\iota$ and $\tau\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ as *vv.ll.* for $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\nu$ in MSS of the *NT* (Elliott 1976, 145). Given its relative nuance, $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ could have been a better replacement than $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon\iota$ and $\tau\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$. Individual scribes evidently made occasional attempts to smooth away a non-puristic characteristic, but at the same time refrained from increasing the degree of Atticising pretension of the language.
- ² Select occurrences will be found in Gignac I 146, II 152 ($\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$), and II 154 ($\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\nu$). The evidence supplied by an epigram of Balbilla (SB V 8211.4 = *GDI* I 321.3 = A. & É. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon* [IFAO - Bibl. d' Ét. 31, 1960] no. 29.2) is irrelevant to the present discussion, *pace* Hernandez Lara 1994, 157. For information on the usage of magical texts see Gignac II 152 n. 4.
- ³ Cf. Hernandez Lara 1994, 157.
- ⁴ Cf. § 1.3.5 no. B 9.
- ⁵ The script is 'a good large official cursive' (J.R. Rea, *P.Oxy.* XLIII [1975] p. 46). Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine the stemmatic relationship between this copy and P. Oxy. 2104.
- ⁶ See ll. 19-21 along with J. Rea's corrections published in *P. Oxy.* XLIII (1975) p. 47 (cf. *BL*

removed at least two or three steps from the original, according to whether the copy which was dispatched to Egypt and was included in the prefect's *commentarii* descended directly or indirectly from the original. P. Oxy. 2104 and the *Digest* display slight textual discrepancies.¹ This supplies proof of the reliability of the *Digest* text in terms of juridical faithfulness to the original,² but shows that the language of the letter was altered in the course of the transmission. θᾶττον, however, undoubtedly occurred in the original text of the letter, as is shown by the agreement between a source removed more than one step from the original and the independent line of transmission represented by Paul's lost *Responsa* and the manuscript tradition of the *Digest*. It follows that the present occurrence of θᾶττον can be used as firm evidence for the practice of purism in the third-century imperial chancery.

The consistent adoption of θᾶττον in the letter of Antoninus Pius represents a reliable indicator of intense puristic intervention. This mode of activity fits in well to the remarkable puristic profile of the letter (§ 1.3.5 no. B 9). The writer probably considered the linguistic form of imperial correspondence worthy of puristic refinement. No inference of general validity, however, can be drawn from this case, since the surviving letters of Roman emperors, including those written during the reign of Pius, vary considerably in their level of puristic intensity. Only some of them exhibit an equally marked influence of Atticism (§ 1.3.5). Similar considerations suggest that it would be unwise to attach general validity to Severus Alexander's letter.

Prefectural Decrees

1.2.1.2.2. No attestation of θᾶττον has yet come to light, whereas τάχιον is found in SB V 8072.8 (= P. Princ. II 20.8),³ a second-century edict which may have been

VII 143). The identity of the prefect is unknown: J. Rea's correction of the reading Ἀννείαν[οῦ] has removed his putative name (so *ed.pr.*; Wilcken, *APF* 9 [1930] 91; Bureth 1988, 493) or the presumed name of his secretary (so Schulz 1961, 184 n. 3); cf. Bastianini 1988, 514.

¹ They are as follows (the numbering is that of P. Oxy. 2104; A = *Digest*, B = P. Oxy. 2104, C = P. Oxy. 3106): 7-8 οτε . . . ποτε (ποτε *post* θαττον *insertum*) B : ὁπότε A : C *deest* | 7 ε[τ]ε[ρ]αν B : τήν ἑτέραν A : C *deest* | τραπεζομενον B : τρεπόμενον A : C *deest* || 11 ἀπαγορεύομεν A : απαγορευ[ω] C : απαγορευ[ε] B || και *post* απαγορευω *add.* C : B *deest*. One major discrepancy is the absence of P. Oxy. 2104.15-18 ~ P. Oxy. 3106.9 (τοὺς—) -11 from the *Digest* text.

² See U. Wilcken, *APF* 9 (1930) 90 and Meyer 1930, 341. This is a significant fact since excerpts taken from Paul's *Responsa* often underwent revision in the later juristic tradition (see e.g. Schulz 1961, 304-305), not only in the *Digest* but also in the so-called *Fragmenta Vaticana* (*FIRA* II 464 ff.).

³ I assume that the reading of the papyrus copy is genuine.

Chapter Three

issued by M. Petronius Mamertinus (in office AD 133 to 137).¹ In other documents dispatched by the prefectural chancery during his tenure of office, the extent of the impact of puristic intervention on performance is very limited; writers seem to have refrained from severe purism (§ 1.3.6). The use of *τάχιον*, whether consciously or unconsciously motivated, fits in well to this unfavourable attitude to intense archaising affectation. Like imperial correspondence, texts dispatched by the office of the prefect of Egypt reveal varying attitudes to language cultivation (§ 1.3.6). The personal inclination of writers evidently played an important role in language selection. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine the identity of the man who composed the present edict on behalf of Mamertinus.

Private Correspondence

1.2.1.2.3. In sharp contrast to official decrees, a great deal of information on personal letters is available. Writers had many opportunities to express the idea of 'speed' in their private and business correspondence, and they often conveyed it with the comparative form of the adverb,² which they used not only to express comparison ('more quickly') but also in an elative sense ('quite quickly', 'as quickly as possible') and even in a positive sense ('quickly').³ The present ratio of *τάχιον* : *θαττον* in papyrus letters of the Roman and late Roman periods seems to be 30:1, the only occurrence of *θαττον* being P.Oxy. I 122.6.⁴ Comparative word-frequency shows how uncommon this form was in everyday correspondence, and therefore confirms that it enjoyed very limited re-integration into the living speech. The revival of such an obsolete form by Gaianus, the sender of the Oxyrhynchus letter, represents an act of premeditated puristic intervention, which in turn seems to be a function of his aim at literary distinction (cf. Ch. IV § 1.2.2). It may be noted that late antique 'literary' letter-writing displays a marked preference for the puristic form: Gregory of Nazianzus fluctuated

¹ So (tentatively) O.W. Reinmuth, *CPh* 31 (1936) 148. This identification has been accepted by other scholars, see Bureth 1988, 484 and (dubiously) R. Katzoff in *ANRW* II 13 (1980) 815 no. 31. On Mamertinus see Bureth 1988, 484; Bastianini 1975, 286-288; Bastianini 1988, 508.

² For further expressions see e.g. Eisner, *P. Iand.* II (1913) p. 48; add *τάχα*, *ταχύ*.

³ On the elative function of comparatives see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 244 (1) with n. 2; Mayser II 1, p. 49-50; Turner, *Syntax* 30. In the wake of Mayser, Turner noted that it 'is not class. usage', and asserted that it 'is characteristic of the inferior popular speech'. On *τάχιον* 'quickly' see Turner, *Syntax* 30.

⁴ The papyrus was assigned to the late third or fourth century AD, but I should date it to the late second century: cf. Ch. IV § 1.2.2.

between $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ and $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\omicron\nu$,¹ but other epistolographers such as Basil of Caesarea, Synesius, and Libanius seem to have adopted $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ more consistently.² Gaianus' conduct is an excellent illustration of the effects of marked puristic intervention on epistolary performance before those celebrated writers. His letter, however, also exhibits features characteristic of lower level Greek (cf. Ch. IV § 1.2.2). This shows that the use of high-profile puristic words in antiquity was not necessarily linked with an effort to avoid vulgar items. The problem, in this case, is to determine to what extent Gaianus was responsible for the unbalanced performance: the scribe who penned the body of the letter on his behalf may have inadvertently increased his chosen level of tolerance for colloquial elements (Ch. IV § 1.2.2).

$\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\omicron\nu$ occurs in the following letters:

i AD:

1. P.Amst. I 89.10 (AD 3);
2. P.Oxy. XXXVIII 2844.8 (2nd half of the century);
3. SB III 7258.8;

i/ii AD:

4. BGU II 451.11;

ii AD:

5. P.Mich. VIII 485.17 (AD 105³);
6. P.Oxy. I 113.24;
7. P.Oxy. III 531.8 (= *W.Chr.* 482 = Hengstl 1978 no. 83);
8. SB VI 9523.2;
9. P.Mich. VIII 501.13;
10. P.Ross.Georg. V 4.15;
11. P.Oslo II 52.15;
12. P.Oslo II 60.7;
13. P.Mich. XV 752.39 (late second century), written by a man, Sempronius, whose activities are documented by numerous papyri;⁴
14. P.Mich. III 209 (re-ed. by Bell 1950, 43-44; late second century), from the same archive as no. 13;
15. SB XII 11237.2-3 (second century ?);⁵

ii or iii AD:

16. P.Mich. III 211.5;

¹ 2 exx. of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\omicron\nu$ (*epp.* 133.1, p. 97.17 and 152.3, p. 111.23 Gallay, GCS) versus 3 exx. of $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ (*epp.* 22.3, p. 22.10; 32.10, p. 29.27; 130.2, p. 95.23 Gallay, GCS). Cf. Gallay 1933, 17.

² Basil of Caesarea: 1 case of $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\omicron\nu$ (*ep.* 28.2.20 Courtonne) versus 9 exx. of $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ (excluding *ep.* 364.10 Court., which is addressed to, and not written by, Basil, and is often regarded as spurious); $\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ is the only form to occur in Synesius (4x; cf. Fritz 1898, 37) and Libanius (5x). I assume the data not to have been significantly altered in the course of the textual transmission.

³ Cf. K. Strobel, *ZPE* 71 (1988) 257-258 n. 35, 260.

⁴ On this archive see Appendix (B) § 1.6.

⁵ Pack² 2647. For a revised edition of the text see D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 13 (1974) 110, who also identified it as a private letter.

Chapter Three

ii/iii AD:

- 17. BGU I 417.28;
- 18. P.Oxy. XLI 2982.13;
- 19. P.Haun. II 16.13;

iii AD:

- 20. P.Prag.Varcl 29.11 (= SB VI 9415.29.11), from the 'Heroninus archive' ¹ (AD 256);
- 21. P.Stras. I 32.6 (= P. Flor. II 134**), from the 'Heroninus archive' (AD 261);
- 22. SB III 6262.14,18 (= *Sel. Pap.* I 133 = White 1986 no. 115);
- 23. P.Oslo III 159.10;

iii or iv AD:

- 24. P.Iand. II 11.5 (= Ghedini 1923 no. 5 = Naldini 1998 no. 7);²

iii/iv AD:

- 25. P.Gron. 18.8 (= Naldini 1998 no. 25);
- 26. SB XVI 12694.3;
- 27. PSI VIII 971.4-5;

iv AD:

- 28. P.Kell. G. I 7.9 (c. AD 350 ?);
- 29. P.Ross. Georg. V 6.25 (= P. Iand. II 13.17; Oxy.);
- 30. P.Nag.Hamm. 70.15.

Texts 3, 8, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23, 29 are familiar letters. Some of the other items deal with private affairs (no. 27) and/or with practical matters (nos. 6, 16, 28). Texts 2, 20, 21, and 26 are business letters. Text 25 is written by a monk. These letters are not homogeneous in register, although the individuals who wrote them appear to have shared an aversion for highly artificial constructions. Consequently, there is no reason to assume that the use of *τάχιον* stems from the influence of a single factor. Each case needs to be assessed separately.

The individual who wrote Text 19 appears to have had good facility in prose composition. The letter, which was penned in a literary hand (App. (A) I 14), is characterised by a fluent style and careful word order (cf. ll. 4-6). The writer was also aware of purism and practised self-censorship by incorporating a well-integrated puristic item in the text (§ 1.3.3 (IV)). *θαύρατον* may well have struck him as an over-pretentious linguistic ingredient (cf. § 1.3.3 (IV)). One then wonders whether high profile variants were considered unfit for epistolary communication or for the specific occasion on which the letter was written.

None of the other letters equals this item in stylistic refinement. Texts 22 and 26 rank very low in register. The writers may have had limited linguistic competence and therefore may have been unaware of puristic Greek. By contrast,

¹ On this archive see Montevicchi 1988, 256, 576 (no. 57). For a recent economic study see D. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-Century A.D. Egypt. The Heroninos Archive and the Appianus Estate* (Cambridge 1991).

² iii AD: *ed.pr.*, Naldini; iv AD: U. Wilcken, *APF* 6 (1913) 293.

Chapter Three

while being predominantly unpretentious, the style of other letters is much less vulgar. This makes it difficult to tell whether the use of *τόχιον* depends on avoidance of high-profile puristic items in everyday correspondence or on mere unawareness of purism. Item 13 will serve as a good example. The letter is full of lower-level linguistic features, which appear to have been recurrent constituents of the writer's casual epistolary style.¹

In another familiar letter, however, the same man sought to raise his normal level of written performance.² This demonstrates that he was aware of stylistic register. Yet there is no telling whether he was also acquainted with purism. The motive behind his choice of *τόχιον* cannot be determined. Similar considerations apply to other letters. Text 25, for example, is characterised not only by a standard post-classical language but also by a fluent and occasionally thoughtful style. The writer shows facility in prose composition. Certain features of style might have been chosen with care, but it is unclear whether the same applies to vocabulary. Assuming the use of *τόχιον* to have been goal-directed, did the monk regard extreme purism as unfit for the specific occasion on which his letter was written, or was he averse to purism in general? Unfortunately, P.Gron. 17, another letter of his, provides no secure information on this issue. This uncertainty precludes the comparison of the monk's attitude to purism with that of contemporary Christians, and also with that of later Christian epistolographers. (As we have seen, Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil of Caesarea adopted *τόχιον* occasionally. Later Christian letter-writing displays widely varied attitudes to purism.)³ Another interesting case is Text 6. There is evidence to show that the individual who wrote the letter was concerned with good linguistic usage.⁴

He may have had a feeling for language, but how developed this was we cannot tell. This uncertainty is a warning against dismissing the possibility that the writer took some care over word selection, but admittedly does not prove that he was able to practise puristic self-censorship. In the same way, we are no longer in a position to define the level of linguistic competence of the individuals responsible for the other papyrus letters listed above.

Petitions

1.2.1.2.4. A case of *θαύρον* is found in P.Vind.Tand. 2.5, an early third-

¹ Cf. App. (B) § 1.6 (1),(2); cf. also D.

² Cf. App. (B) § 1.6 (i)-(ii).

³ See, for example, Ch. II § 2.7.

⁴ Cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 2.

century draft petition from a former exegetes of Heracleopolis to the prefect of Egypt.¹ The writer made occasional use not only of elements of rhetorical style (cf. l. 9 πέπονθα τε καὶ παρ' ἔκα[σ]τα πάσχω) but also of choice words. The term 'petition', for instance, was rendered with the lexeme ἵκετηρία (l. 4) instead of with commoner synonyms such as βιβλίδιον, which the writer himself used a few lines below, ἐντυχία, ἀναφορά, and ἀναφόριον. The personal pronoun 'you' was substituted with an uncommon abstract expression (τὴν σὴν ἀγχίνοιαν 'your sagacity') at l. 5.² Furthermore, the papyrus exhibits many first-hand textual alterations which represent manifestations of concern for language and style:³

- (i) Corrections aiming to emend misspellings: 5 φθάς·εῖν; 6 (marg.) [[ε]]ῖχνεσι; γενναιοτάτου (αι ex ε); 9 κωθ[[ο]]ώνικῆς; 10 ἑταιρεία[ς] (αι ex ε); συγγεν·εῖας; 12 alteration of δέ into τε. Cf. also ll. 8-9 μεισοπνηρήσα[ς] (μεισο- ex μισο-); 10 ἑταιρεία[ς] (-ρειας ex -ριας), although these are clearly mistaken corrections.
- (ii) Stylistic alterations: 4 [[πιστεύων μου]] ἔπειθ' αὐτὴν μου τὴν ἵκετηρίαν (lexical substitution and re-arrangement of word order⁴); 5 addition of μάλιστα δὲ ἐπὶ (l. ἐπεὶ), μέγιστ[ε] ἡγεμών above the line to emphasise the point which was being made; 21 addition of δέ at the beginning of the clause.

The writer not only was aware of language and style, but also sought to produce a refined composition which might please the recipient. He even subjected his performance to stylistic revision. In particular, the presence of textual alterations of stylistic nature in the clause in which θᾶττον occurs ((ii) above) suggests that the writer composed the whole sequence very carefully. The puristic censorship which led to the adoption of θᾶττον is thus likely to have been undertaken consciously. Once more the deliberate reception of a feature characteristic of severe purism is correlated with distinct stylistic ambitions.

¹ That the papyrus is a draft (so the editors), and not a fair copy (so H.J. Wolff, ZRG 96 [1979] 326), is strongly suggested by the following arguments: (a) the text is written against the fibres on the back of a document; (b) the name of the prefect was not stated; (c) many corrections were entered above the line.

² See the editors' note.

³ On the importance of 'author's corrections' for the linguist see Ch. I § 3.4.4.2.

⁴ The petitioner wanted to convey this message: 'trusting the present petition of mine to reach you quickly . . .'. He wrote πιστεύων μου. He soon changed his mind and realised that the position of μου would entail an unsatisfactory ordering of words, had it been followed by the sequence 'the present petition' (μου αὐτὴν τὴν ἵκετηρίαν). He thus erased both πιστεύων and μου. He substituted the verb with a better synonym (ἐπειθ') above the line, and then wrote the correct sequence αὐτὴν μου τὴν within the line.

Chapter Three

1.2.2. The dual

1.2.2.1. Prose texts generally lack consistency in their revival of the dual. The ratio of use : non-use fluctuates according to the parts of discourse and to their reciprocal combinations. A distinction needs to be drawn between the following categories of usage:

1. dual forms of numerals (δυσὶν, δυεῖν; ἄμφω, ἀμφοῖν);
2. dual forms of nouns denoting pairs (χεῖρε, πόδε, ὀφθαλμῶ etc.) as complemented by no. 1;
3. dual forms of nouns denoting pairs as uncomplemented by no. 1;
4. dual forms of other nouns as complemented by no. 1;
5. dual forms of other nouns as uncomplemented by no. 1;
6. dual forms of adjectives;
7. dual forms of participles placed in a position close to the element(s) to which they refer;
8. dual forms of participles standing separately from the element(s) to which they refer;
9. dual forms of pronouns;
10. dual forms of finite verbs.

Factors influencing the survival/revival/neglect of the dual operated with different degrees of intensity according to these categories.¹ It is useful for comparative purposes to establish a method of quantitative analysis of evidence. A numerical value can be assigned to each category above. This will help to measure two things: first, the degree of puristic artificiality inherent in each occurrence of the dual by crediting it with the numerical value of the particular category to which it belongs; second, the overall impact of the dual on a given text or portion of text by estimating the score totalled by dual forms attested therein. Using a five-point scale, we can set the following table of concordances between categories of usage and numerical values:

C 1 = 1	C 6 = same value as the noun to
C 2 = 1	which the adj. refers
C 3 = 2	C 7 = 3
C 4 = 3	C 8 = 4
C 5 = 4	C 9 = 4
	C 10 = 5

The higher the mark, the greater the level of artificiality inherent in the revival of dual

¹ Data can be derived from Schmidt 1893, especially from the tables presented at pp. 44-46.

Chapter Three

endings. Category 10 (numerical value 5) thus represents the highest degree of puristic affectation in the use of the dual. The value of each category has been estimated on the basis of two criteria. One of them is the rate of recurrence of the dual (compared with that of the plural) in each part of discourse as examined in a fairly large corpus of post-classical prose works from a variety of periods, genres, and registers of style. The more frequently a part of discourse was supplied with dual endings, the less significant will be individual occurrences of dual forms in that part of discourse, the lower is the mark assigned to them. Another important criterion is the complementary presence of other elements inflected in the dual. Where nominal dual forms are associated with numerals and/or other elements carrying dual endings, I assume the latter to have had a trailing force over the former. Consequently, attestations of the dual associated with Category 1 have received slightly lower values than dual forms uncomplemented by it: contrast Categories 2 and 4 with 3 and 5, respectively. Similarly, the selection of number in participles may have been influenced by their position in relation to the items to which they refer. C 7 and C 8 have thus received different numerical values.

The non-use of the dual, on the other hand, can be measured with a negative numerical scale. Its extremes are to be set in reverse order ('-5' to '-1'), for neglect of comparatively commoner forms posits more intense resistance to purism than neglect of uncommon dual endings. Here follows a table of concordances between categories of non-observance of the dual and negative numerical values:

-C 1 = -5	-C 6 = same value as the noun to which the adj. refers
-C 2 = -5	
-C 3 = -4	-C 7 = -3
-C 4 = -3	-C 8 = -2
-C 5 = -2	-C 9 = -2
	-C 10 = -1

1.2.2.2. The dual was no doubt extinct in living Koine.¹ Its survival or revival in post-classical written sources is an indicator of archaising pretension. In the Hellenistic period, the dual was foreign to non-literary prose, and also to predominantly unpretentious literary writings.² It seems to have progressively retreated even from higher literature; where it occurs, its usage is characterised by a low level of affectation.³

Things changed under the influence of Atticism. Puristic prescriptions aiming to promote the use of the dual are found in several Atticist lexica: cf. Moeris 204.1-2 Bekker (on the personal pronoun),⁴ Phrynichus, *Ecl.* 180-181 Fischer, Aelius Dionysius δ 31-32 Erbse,⁵ and Pseudo-Herodian, *Philet.* 174 and 225 Dain (on the inflection of δόο).

Since the late first century BC, however, writers had already begun to endow the dual with new prestige.⁶ This artificial revival was so pervasive that the dual occasionally filtered into the language of documents even before the full manifestation of linguistic

¹ See e.g. Jannaris 1897 §§ 229, 633, 668; Thumb 1910 §§ 40 and 185.2; Meillet 1965, 273-274; Schwyzer I 127; Debrunner - Scherer 1969 § 182; Moulton 57.

² No examples are apparently attested for the Ptolemaic papyri: the uncertain case cited by Mayser I 2, p. 1 n. 1 and Wackernagel 1943, 188 (= 1953, 887) (BGU IV 1185.3, a decree of Ptolemy Auletes of c. 60 BC which has been re-edited as *COrdPtol*² 71) rests on an incorrect reading, see U. Wilcken, *APF* 6 (1920) 404-405, whose textual reconstruction is reproduced in *COrdPtol*² (see comm., p. 201). Schweizer 1898, 138 found no ex. in inscriptions from Hellenistic Pergamon. No ex. occurs in the *Letter of Aristeas* (Meecham 1935, 157) and the *LXX* (Thackeray 1909, 22,92,192,195).

³ See Schmidt 1893, 5 ff. (data on the dual's retreat are tabulated and summarised at p. 44). Polybius, for instance, generally scores low marks, since he mostly applies dual forms to verbal groups constituted by C 1+C 2 (score 1+1= 2; one case of C 3: 18.29.3); MSS display only one ex. of C 4 (10.12.6 ἀπὸ δουεῖν σταδίων [σταδίων Dindorf]: score 1+3 = 4): see Schmidt 1893, 22-24; de Foucault 1972, 69; Wahlgren 1995, 35.

⁴ Cf. also Orus B 108 Alp. with Alpers' commentary *ad loc.* (1981, 238-239).

⁵ On these sources see Tosi 1988, 183-184.

⁶ Cf. Schmidt 1893, 44. On the Atticising character of this revival see Schmid I 88,

Atticism in the course of the second century AD.¹ In this century, and also in subsequent ones, dual forms generally continued to be avoided in low-level non-puristic prose. By contrast, the stronger the Atticising pretension of a text, the more frequent the use of dual forms, although rigorous consistency was never pursued. Moreover, the more marked the puristic orientation of a text, the greater was the inclination to revive dual forms belonging to Categories 4-10.

Select information. The dual is missing in the *NT* and other early Christian writings.² The practice of novelists varies,³ as is shown by the following data:

Xenophon: 1 ex. of C 1 (but in combination with -C 4), see 3.8.5 *δυοῖν* . . . *θεοῖς*.

Chariton: 3 exx. of C 1, always in conjunction with plural forms.

Longus: 3 exx. of C 1, that is: 1 ex. of *δυοῖν* (gen.) in conjunction with -C 4 and C 7,⁴
2 exx. of *ἄμφω* (in conjunction with plur. forms);

1 ex. of C 7 (1.7.1: so MS V, see n. 4)

versus cases of -C 1 (including 3 exx. of *δύο* (gen.) and 11 exx. of *ἀμφότεροι*),
-C 2 (1.30.5 *ταῖς δύο χερσὶ* [MSS : *δύο* 'fort. delendum' Reeve]),
-C 3 (many exx.).

Achilles Tatius: 16 exx. of C 1 (always in conjunction with plur. forms);

4 exx. of C 3;

1 ex. of C 10 (though coupled with a plural ending: 4.12.3 *ἐρίζετον ἀλλήλοις*).

Xenophon is the loosest of all, whereas Achilles Tatius seems to be the strictest. But all the novelists lack consistency: note their inclination to use plural forms after the dual of numerals. C 4-10 are generally avoided.

The Atticists used the dual more often; even the more obsolete C 7-10 were frequently revived, especially by Aelian, Aelius Aristides, and Philostratus. Yet the juxtaposition of dual and plural forms (especially of participles and finite verbs) was not avoided altogether.⁵ A similar variety of attitudes is apparent in late Roman and early Byzantine literary prose. Consistency, however, was alien even to stylistically pretentious writings. For instance, Themistius in his orations did not refrain from using the plural instead of the dual and particularly from coupling dual forms of numerals with plural participles and finite verbs (e.g. *Or.* 34.1, II 212.13-16 Dow.-Nor. *ἣ γὰρ ἐπήραμεν ἄμφω . . . καταγαγόντες, ἣ ἄμφω καταβεβλήκαμεν*, in a stylistically complex preamble, see Matino 1986, 113-114).⁶

Debrunner-Scherer 1969 § 158. For further information on the dual in writers of the early Roman period see Schmidt 1893, 26 ff.; Wahlgren 1995, 35-36.

¹ Wackernagel 1943, 188-189 (= 1953, 887-888). See also § 1.3.8 (D).

² See Radermacher 1925, 77, 81; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf p. 79 and §§ 2, 65. No ex. even in numerals, see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 63(1) and Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich 208 s.v. *δύο*.

³ See Papanikolaou 1973, 93-94 (revising previous literature). On Chariton cf. also Hernandez Lara 1991, 49.

⁴ 1.7.1 *τοσούτων δυοῖν ἀποδεόντων* (V : *-όντων* Seiler, accepted by Reeve : *F deest*).

⁵ Dio Chrys.: Schmid I 87. Lucian: Schmid I 233-234. Aelius Aristides II 35-36. Aelian: III 46-48. Philostratus: Schmid: IV 43-47. Maximus of Tyre: Dürr 1899-1901, 15-16.

⁶ Cf. also Fritz 1898, 71-73; R. Romano, *Koinonia* 2 (1978) 340; G. Matino, *Koinonia* 8 (1984) 91. Exx. of *ἄμφω* are cited by Matino 1986, 38, 113.

Chapter Three

Late antique epistolographers:

- Synesius: (i) Ratio of ἄμφω / ἀμφοῖν : ἀμφοτέρω: 5+8:2; a severe revival of the dual is found in ep. 154 p. 274.1 Garzya ἄμφω με τούτω τῷ γένει διαβεβλήκατον (C 1 + C 6 + C 4 + C 10). But elsewhere (4x) plural endings follow the dual.
(ii) Ratio of δυοῖν : δύο (gen.): 7:1 (4 cases of plur. after δυοῖν; but δυοῖν Νεκύων at ep. 5 p. 17.14 Garzya).
(iii) δύο (nom., acc.) is always combined with plural forms (4x).
(iv) 1x C 5: ep. 61 p. 102.2 Garzya (δυοῖν add. AvVa).

Basil of Caesarea: (i) Ratio of ἀμφοῖν : ἀμφοτέρων: 2:8 (ep. 97.21 Courtonne has C 1 + C 4).

- (ii) Ratio of ἄμφω : ἀμφοτέροι: 0:2.
(iii) Ratio of δυοῖν / δυεῖν : δύο (gen.): 3+1:9. Of the four cases of dual, one is followed by C 9 (ep. 9.1.7 Courtonne), one by -C 4.
(iv) Ratio of plur. : dual after δύο (nom., acc.): 4:0.

- Gregory of Nazianzus: (i) Ratio of ἀμφοῖν : ἀμφοτέρων: 0:5.
(ii) Ratio of ἄμφω : ἀμφοτέροι: 1:2. ἄμφω is combined with -C 10 (ep. 204.1 Gallay, GCS).
(iii) Ratio of δυοῖν : δύο (gen.): 3:2.
(iv) Ratio of plur. : dual after δύο (nom., acc.): 2:1 (ep. 198.4 Gallay, GCS ἵππῳ δύο).

Scattered exx. occur in Byzantine and Medieval chronicles, depending on their degree of Atticising pretension, see Psaltes 1913 § 272: note the absence of attestations in Malalas (L. Merz, *Zur Flexion des Verbums bei Malalas* [Progr. Pirmasens 1911] 41). More frequent and more significant occurrences are found in more strongly Atticising writers such as Psellos, see Böhlig 1956, 89-90.

In other words, the dual was a significant mark of Atticising pretension in Greek prose style of the Roman and Byzantine periods. This is especially true of Categories 5-10.

1.2.2.3. The dual was occasionally revived in Greek documents of the second to sixth centuries AD,¹ very probably under the influence of Atticism.² This accounts for the fact that they agree with contemporary Atticising literary prose against the normal practice of similar sources which were written a few centuries earlier in the same geographical areas. The use of dual forms provides documentary prose style with uncommon literary colouring.

1.2.2.3.1. Occasional occurrences are found even in contracts and receipts.

Here are some items of evidence, listed in chronological order:³

1. AD 25/26: PSI VIII 905.7 (cession of catocic land): τῶν δυεῖν ἀρουρῶν (score 1+ -3 = -2), but ἀρουρῶν δύο occurs in the duplicate copy P.Mich. V 252.4

¹ Cf. Wackernagel 1943, 189-190 (= 1953, 888-889). In particular, on papyrus documents see Gignac II 3, 188-190. On inscriptions from Roman Attica see Meisterhans - Schwyzer § 83(14); Schmidt 1893, 42-43; Threutte II 19-20, 92-94, 416, 454 (but occurrences in metrical inscriptions should not be taken into account).

² Cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzer § 83(13), followed by Schmidt 1893, 43, who attribute the occurrences of the dual in inscriptions from Roman Attica to the 'blooming of classical studies' of the time.

³ P.Vindob. G 12253, a lease of AD 305, has ἀμφοτέροις (P.Rain.Cent. 82.4), and not ἀμφοτέροιν (so the *ed.pr.*, CPR I 41.3, cited by Gignac II 190).

- (cf. Ch. I § 3.2.1.1 (i)), which was written by the same scribe as PSI 905;
2. AD 151: P.Stras. I 52.33 (Herm.; subscription to a bank διαγραφή): ἀρουρῶν δυοῖν (score 1+ -3 = -2);
 3. AD 155: P.Berl.Frisk 1.379 = SB V 7515.379 (receipt included in a long τόμος συγκολλήσιμος):¹ τῶν δυεῖν μερίδω[ν] (score 1+ -3 = -2). Other receipts written by different scribes but pasted on the same roll have δύο μερίδων, see e.g. P.Berl.Frisk 1. 263;
 4. ii AD: P.Ryl. II 269.5 (Herm. (?); declaration or affidavit for use in legal proceedings): ἐκ δυεῖν οἴκ[ω]ν (score 1+ -3 = -2);
 5. AD 209-211: P.Ryl. II 357.7 descr., ed. P.J. Sijpesteijn, *Analecta Papyrologica* 2 (1990) 77 (receipt for ἐνοίκιον and φόρος): ἀρουρῶν δυεῖν (score 1+ -3 = -2);
 6. AD 235: P.Ryl. II 109.5-6, repr. in M. Amelotti, *Il testamento romano attraverso la prassi documentale*, I. *Le forme classiche di testamento* (Florence 1966) 270 no. 12; cf. 57 no. 53 (declaration on oath of valuation of an inheritance; Herm.): τῶ[ν] δυεῖν προδεδ[η]λομένων ἀφηλίκων (score 1+ -3 + -3 = -5);
 7. c. AD 267: P.Teb. II 326.5 = M.Chr. 325 (request to the prefect Juvenius Genialis for the appointment of a guardian):² l. 5 ἀμφοῖν (C 1; 1);
 8. c. AD 280: P.Vind.Bosw. 4.7 (Herm.; request to the prefect Sallustius Hadrianus for consent to *cessio bonorum*):³ l. 7 ἀμφοῖν ἡμῶν (C 1 + -C 9: score 1 + -2);
 9. AD 524 or 539: P.Cair.Masp. III 67307.13, re-ed. G. Malz, in *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni*, II (Milan 1957) 353-354 (receipt; Aphrod.): τῶν προκ(εμμένων) δυεῖν νομισμάτων (score -3 + 1+ -3 = -5). A reference to these two nomismata is also found at l. 15, but the numeral has been lost in the lacuna: did the scribe use the plural or the dual?
 10. AD 569: deed of divorce drawn up at Antinoopolis, of which three copies have survived: A = P.Lond. V 1713, B = P.Flor. I 93, C = P.Cair.Masp. III 67311. ἀμφοῖν is given by all copies (A: l. 18; B: l. 12, C: l. 14) and is therefore original;
 11. AD 583/584: P.Lond. V 1727.17 = *Sel. Pap.* I 86 = *FIRA* III 67 (in part) (Syene; will): τῶν ἀμφοῖν ἡμῶν τέκνων (C 1 + -C 9 + -C 4: total score -4);
 12. vi or vii AD: P.Lond. I 113 (2).10 (p. 205) (model form for the conveyance of property): ἐξ ἀμφοῖν;
 13. vii AD: SB VI 8986 (after 26.1.641, see *BL* VII 200) (contract of marriage from Apollonopolis Magna): l. 23 has ἐξ ἀμφοῖν.

The revival of the dual in all these documents is characterised by a low degree of puristic intensity, as indicated by: (a) the scoring of low marks; (b) the use of those dual forms (C 1) which had achieved greater re-integration into the language system; (c) the association of dual and plural forms in one and the same phrase, and particularly the employment of clusters composed of C 1 + -C 4; (d) the use of τῶν instead of τοῖν in Texts 1,3,6,9,11; (e) the avoidance of the dual in other passages: Text 6, for example, has κληρονόμους . . . ἀμφοτέρους ἡμᾶς | τοὺς . . . υἰέας at ll. 7-8. Nevertheless, even such a

¹ P.Berl.Frisk 1 + P.Col. II 1 recto 4 + P.Col. V 1 verso 4 + SB XVI 13060 + BGU XIII 2271 + BGU XIII 2270.

² On the prefect Juvenius Genialis see Bastianini 1975, 316; Bureth 1988, 495; Bastianini 1988, 515.

³ On the prefect Sallustius Hadrianus see Bastianini 1975, 317-318; Bureth 1988, 495; Bastianini 1988, 515.

mild revival of the dual is remarkable. Moderately Atticising literary writings do not display considerably different usage (cf. § 1.2.2.2), and contracts of the Roman and Byzantine periods generally exhibit -C 1, the above occurrences of dual forms being exceptions to the rule. This marked contrast with similar sources written in the same period shows that the revival of the dual in Texts 1-13 reflects no general tendency, but is a manifestation of self-censoring purism peculiar to the individuals who composed the texts. One wonders whether the censorship was undertaken unconsciously or deliberately, and if the latter, with what motives in mind. It is impossible to find a firm answer to each case, but it would be hasty to assume that a single factor took an active part in all the thirteen documents. Deliberate puristic intervention may have operated in Text 6, in which the dual is complemented by the artificial revival of the archaising but possibly non-puristic form *υἱέας* (l. 8).¹ The high rank of the recipient may have been an influential consideration in the reception of these old-fashioned forms.² It is also tempting to assume an influence of conscious puristic activity on Texts 7 and 8, because they were addressed to the governor of Egypt. But admittedly there is no internal argument to support the case. On the other hand, the private character of Texts 1,2,5,9,11-13 suggests that the individuals who composed them practised unplanned self-censorship, perhaps under the influence of writing. This would explain not only the replacement of the dual with the plural in another autograph copy of Text 1, but also the fact that the scribe responsible for Text 9 adopted the plural instead of the dual in other private documents.³

In some cases, the absence of information on the social background and the profession of the individuals who wrote the documents prevents us from carrying out a sociological analysis of the puristic attitudes which shaped their revival of the dual. Phibion, the individual who wrote Text 2 on behalf of an illiterate woman, is not attested elsewhere. Herodes, the man who penned Text 1, was an accomplished writer who lent his services not only to the two individuals mentioned in the text under consideration, but also to other illiterate and semi-literate people.⁴ He may well have

¹ Unlike the dat. *υἱεῖ*, the accusative singular *υἱέα* was condemned by Phrynichus, see *Praep. soph.* 118.5-6 de Borries, *Ecl.* 234 Fischer. Does the same apply to the plural endings?

² The declaration was presumably addressed to the strategus.

³ In P.Cair.Masp. III 67296, a guarantee of AD 535, he wrote *ἀμφοτέρων* (l. 4) and *ὁμολογοῦμεν . . . ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων ἀναδεχόμενοι, ὁμνύοντες* (ll. 4-5: two people are involved). The use of dual forms in the latter would have provided the document with an unusually marked puristic profile, but *ἀμφοτέρων* could have been replaced with *ἀμφοῖν*. P.Michael. 45, a sale of land of 540, has *ἀμφοτέροι ποιμένες . . . ὑπογράφοντες . . . ὀρμώμενοι* (ll. 3-4): at least *ἄμφω* could have been used in place of *ἀμφοτέροι*.

⁴ Cf. P.Mich. V 257, 293, 346, PSI X 1130 (BL IX 320).

been a professional scribe, but the hypothesis cannot be verified.¹ We are also uninformed about the man who was entrusted by a group of inhabitants of Kerkeosiris with the task of writing the receipt no. 3. There is evidence to show, however, that professional scribes practised puristic self-censorship in the Byzantine period. Text 9 was penned by Abraam son of Apollos, a well-known notary from Aphrodito.² Text 11 was written by Allamon, a professional scribe from Syene.³ All the three copies of Text 10 were penned by Dioscorus, the well-known notary who also composed hexameter and iambic poems (§ 2.2.4). This demonstrates that in spite of the possible separation between linguistic schooling and scribal training in the Byzantine period (Ch. I § 3.3.2) at least some notaries were acquainted with the puristic features that were usually taught in schools. Dioscorus even owned papyri containing extensive conjugation tables, which he might have used for school instruction (Ch. II § 1.3.1). As we have seen, dual forms are regularly employed in these tables (Ch. II § 1.3.1). Whether Abraam and Allamon were men of equally wide cultural interests we cannot tell, but they presumably received grammatical schooling. As their own usage of the dual shows, they undertook puristic self-censorship only in occasional circumstances. This suggests that sixth-century notaries were not required to comply with the puristic rules of Atticism. Unsurprisingly, official formulae ignore the dual. This is very clear in consular and post-consular dates, where scribes consistently employed plural endings. An exceptional case of a dual ending in a consular dating formula occurs in an epigraphic letter of AD 174 from Tyrians in Puteoli to Tyre.⁴

As expected, professional scribes were not the only people who adopted dual forms in private documents. Text 5 was written by Valerius Proc(u)leianus, a Roman citizen. His hand is not that of a person to whom writing is a new accomplishment,⁵ but certainly it does not display the same degree of fluency as average chancery hands. I wish that we knew more about him.

1.2.2.3.2. Acts of puristic self-censorship, whether premeditated or not, also led to a sporadic revival of the dual in sources that were less constrained by formulae. In those places in which the plural was retained, the dual appears to have been avoided

-
- ¹ On the very different kinds of people to whom illiterate and semi-literate people resorted for help with writing see Ch. I § 3.2.2.1.
 - ² List of documents signed by him: *Byz. Not.* 24-25.
 - ³ List of documents signed by him: *Byz. Not.* 92.
 - ⁴ IG XIV 830.19 (= IGRR I 421 = OGIS II 595) ὑπάτοις; cf. Wackernagel 1943, 189 (= 1953, 889).
 - ⁵ I cannot agree with the editor of the papyrus, who described Valerius Proc(u)leianus as an unpractised writer.

Chapter Three

either spontaneously or deliberately. Where the censorship was undertaken or neglected consciously, genre, circumstances, and also time seem to have been influential factors in deciding between the variants. It will be convenient to examine evidence genre by genre.

Forensic Oratory

1.2.2.3.2.1. In P.Giss. I 99 (ii/iii AD; Herm.), a fragment of a very Atticising forensic speech (§ 1.3.1.2), the dual is used with unusual rigour:

ll. 15-16 ἐ]ν στή[λαι]ν δυοῖν | [ἐ]μπροσθεν ἰδρυμέ[ν]αιν: C 4 + C 1 + C 8 (score 3+1+4=8);

l. 19 ταῖν στήλαιν: C 5 (score 4).

The distinctive characteristics of these sequences are:

(A) the presence of Categories 4,5,8;

(B) the scoring of a high mark through a single cluster of unusual categories;

(C) the consistent avoidance of plural forms.

Such a consistent revival can best be paralleled from the puristic practice of contemporary Atticists, especially Philostratus (§ 1.2.2.2); less markedly Atticising writings, including the novels, display none of these elements (§ 1.2.2.2). There are further indications of the high degree of artificiality of the language. ἐν στήλαιν δυοῖν sides with fifth-century BC Attic inscriptions (IG I³ 156.23 [440-425 BC], 71.24 [425/24 BC], 78.49-50 [c. 422 (?) BC]) against the practice of Attic inscriptions of the Roman period, where ἐν στήλαις δυσί(ν) is found without exception (Threatte II 416). The use of the feminine article ταῖν in place of τοῖν (l. 19) is a strong mark of archaising pretension: with the exclusion of ταῖν θεαῖν, even classical Attic inscriptions display τοῖν, and not ταῖν, in conjunction with feminine nouns,¹ whereas MSS of Athenian literary writings often have ταῖν.² This form was also used by the most severe Atticists contemporary with the advocate who composed P.Giss. 99.³ Such a highly artificial revival of the dual may have been planned to meet the puristically-oriented rhetorical requirements of the genre, but undoubtedly it is also a function of time. Before the second century AD, evidence for a looser treatment of the dual is found in an oration on a case of theft which is preserved in a first-century autograph (?) manuscript, viz. P.Lond.Lit. 138 cols. iii 5 - v 37:⁴

col. iii 25-26 δυοῖν ὄντοιιν τῶν ἐξορυσσόντων [κ(αὶ) ὄρ- or ἐξορ- Milne]: C 1 + C 7 + -C

¹ Threatte II 92-93, 95; cf. 18-20.

² G.L. Cooper, III, *TAPhA* 103 (1972) 97-125.

³ Cf. Schmid II 35 (Aelius Aristides), IV 45 (Philostratus).

⁴ For further information on this papyrus and particularly on the oration under consideration see § 1.3.1.1 below.

4¹ (score 1+3+ -3= 1)

col. iii 15-16 κουφοῖς τοῖς ποσί: -C 6 + -C 2 (score -5+ -5 = -10)

All contemporary Atticising writers except Philo appear to have preferred *δυσῆν* to *δυσῶν* in the genitive.² The present instance of *δυσῶν* is thus a significant mark of puristic intervention. Another remarkable element is the cluster *δυσῶν ὄντων*, for which only sporadic parallels are found in contemporary literature.³ The use of the plural in the subsequent substantivised participle, however, is a sign of inconsistency which seems to reflect the contemporary practice of coupling *δυσῶν/δυσῆν* with plural elements.⁴ Mildly Atticising writings of the period exhibit only exceptional cases of rigorous acceptance of the dual in similar phrases: cf. Phil. *Quod omn. prob. lib.* 8 *δυσῶν ὄντων ἀδελφοῖν*, and especially (Ps.-?)Plut. *De lib. ed.* 10. 8 A *δυσῆν ὄντων τοῖν μεγίστων ἀγαθοῖν*. The use of *ποσί* instead of *ποδοῖν* was also very frequent in contemporary literature.⁵ These data suggest that the writer's conduct was influenced by the moderate orientation of early first-century Atticism.

Private Correspondence

1.2.2.3.2.2. In private letters that display signs of language cultivation, dual forms were either neglected altogether or were employed to a moderate degree. P. David 14 (= P. Stras. IV 169 + P. Ross. Georg. II 43), a second-century letter written by a certain Dios in a refined style (cf. Ch. IV § 1.3.2), has an occurrence of *ἀμφοῖν* (l. 6: C 1; score 1). The plural, on the other hand, was consistently retained in two early fourth-century classicising letters which belong to the archive of Theophanes:⁶

¹ The substantivised participle is classified here as a noun.

² Cf. Wahlgren 1995, 40. Note, however, that *δυσῶν* occurs frequently as *v.l.*, see e.g. (i) Cohn's apparatus to Phil. *De Ios.* 189; (ii) BT apparatuses to Plut. *Oth.* 17.1, *De virt. mor.* 7. 448 B, *Quaest. Plat.* 2. 1001 B.

³ Cf. Phil. *Quod omn. prob. lib.* 8; (Ps.-?)Plut. *De lib. ed.* 10. 8 A; Plut. *Non posse suav.* 14. 1089 D. Exx. of *δυσῶν/δυσῆν ὄντων* (with or without further plural adjuncts) are found in [Arist.] *Cat.* 12.14 a 31, in Theophrastus (Schmidt 1893, 16), in Philo (*Leg. alleg.* 3.29 [ὄντων *vulg.*], *De Ios.* 189 [*δυσῆν ὄντων ὁμομητρίων*; *δυσῶν, ὄντων, ὁμομητρίων* occur as *v.v.ll.*], *De spec. leg.* 1.201), in Plutarch (*Cic.* 14.6, *Oth.* 17.1, *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 198 C, *Aet. Rom.* 60. 278 E, *De virt. mor.* 7. 448 B, *Quaest. conv.* 8.4. 720 B, *Quaest. Plat.* 2. 1001 B) etc.

⁴ For a rare parallel in strongly Atticising prose see Ael. Arist. 48.583 *δυσῶν ὄντων μερῶν*.

⁵ Philo has *ποδοῖν* at *in Flac.* 70, but *ποσί* elsewhere (14x; cf. esp. *De post. Caini* 80 ἀρτίσις *ποσί*; *De spec. leg.* 3.106 *ποσὶν ἀρτίσις*). Plutarch used *ποσί* consistently (10x; cf. esp. *Arat.* 21.3 *γυμνοῖς τοῖς ποσί*; *Aet. phys.* 22. 917 D *ποσὶ τοῖς ἐμπροσθίσις*; *De soll. an.* 10. 966 C *συνεστραμμένοις τοῖς ποσί*). Exx. of *ποδοῖν* in severe Atticists: Aelian, *De nat. anim.* 26, I 385.17-18 Hercher; Philostr. *Im.* 95, II 380.14 Kayser.

⁶ On the language and style of these letters see Ch. IV §§ 1.3.4.2-1.3.4.3, respectively.

Chapter Three

A. P. Ryl. IV 624 (= Moscardi 1970 no. 4): when speaking of themselves, the two senders consistently employ plural endings, as follows:

6 ἐτελοῦμε[ν]: -C 10 (score -1);

8 [ἡ]μῖν παροῦσι [καὶ] θεωροῦ[σι]ν: -C 9 + -C 7 + -C 7 (score -2 + -3 + -3 = -7);

9-10 ἡμεῖς . . . | καταλιμθέντες διεμείνο[μ]ε[ν] [φιλο]πρευστοῦντες: -C 9 + -C 8 + -C 10 + -C 8 (score -2 + -2 + -1 + -2 = -7);

11 ἡμᾶς: -C 9 (-2);

20 ἡμᾶς: -C 9 (-2).

B. P. Herm. 4 (= Moscardi 1970 no. 9 = Naldini 1998 no. 38): when speaking of themselves, the two senders employ plural endings, as follows:

4-5 εὐχόμενοι: -C 8 (score -2);

9 ἡμῖν: -C 9 (-2).

The writers' decision to resist applying dual endings to participles, pronouns, and finite verbs is consistent with the normal practice of literary prose, both contemporary and antecedent (with the exclusion of second-century Atticists). Had the dual been preferred to the plural in one or other circumstance, the revival would have been quite severe and the degree of puristic affectation unusually high. The writers might in fact have had the same aversion to extreme purism as epistolary theorists such as Philostratus and Pseudo-Libanius (Ch. II §§ 2.1.3, 2.1.5 (B)). Unfortunately, the absence of occurrences of either C 1,2,4 or -C 1,2,4 precludes the assessment of the writers' attitude to comparatively more common dual forms.

Let us now consider both stylistically and linguistically unpretentious private letters. Dual forms occur at least in two such letters:

1. PSI IV 286.14 (late iii/early iv AD; Oxy.): τῶν δυεῖν μηχανῶν: C 1 + -C 4 (score 1 + -3 = -2);

2. SB VI 9616v.24 (c. AD 550-558 (?); Ant.): τῶν δυοῖν τῶν ζώων: C 1 + -C 4 (score 1 + -3 = -2);

The impact of purism is tenuous, as indicated by (a) the scoring of low marks; (b) the use of those dual forms (C 1) which had achieved greater re-integration into the language system; (c) the association of dual and plural forms in one and the same phrase, and particularly the employment of clusters composed of C 1 + -C 4; (d) the use of τῶν instead of τοῖν. The absence of complementary signs of language cultivation and the personal content suggest that we are dealing with two cases of unplanned mild self-censorship, perhaps undertaken under the influence of writing. Not only the low level of puristic intensity inherent in the censorship, but also the determinants of the writers' puristic intervention point to the existence of an affinity between these letters and some of the documents discussed at § 1.2.2.3.1.

On the other hand, plural endings are retained throughout in the vast majority of unpretentious letters, including those composed by educated individuals. Even dual forms that achieved greater re-integration into the language system are avoided. There is no reason to assume the existence of a single determinant of usage in

Chapter Three

all the extant cases. Indeed, that a variety of factors may be involved is suggested by the following considerations. Let us first consider a boy who is fortunate enough to receive grammatical schooling. The Graeco-Roman educational system allows him to gain not only knowledge of dual endings, but also ability to inflect them correctly in actual usage (Ch. II § 1.3.1). He is free to use or neglect the dual in written performance. The boy grows up. He may retain his acquired standard of competence or may even improve it by proceeding to higher education and/or by cultivating humanities. If such a well-educated individual avoids the dual in his informal correspondence, that posits an effort, either premeditated or unconscious, to resist puristic self-censorship. But after quitting the grammarian's class, the linguistic competence of the same boy may also regress to a more primitive state as years go by, if he does not pursue his studies any further and has no interest in literature, and if his job entails no familiarity with creative manipulation of words. If one such individual employs plural forms, it may result either from a desire to refrain from puristic activity (just as in the above case) or from insufficient competence. There is yet another possibility. The boy who withdraws from school before receiving grammatical schooling has no background in grammar, but is able to write inelegant capitals. He may still improve his writing ability in course of time through special training and/or practice (cf. e.g. Ch. I § 3.3.2). If one such experienced writer makes no use of the dual, that is likely to occur because he is unacquainted with the puristic language variety. It follows that the use of the plural in unpretentious letters penned by mature writers can be the result of

either (A) an act of resistance, whether premeditated or unconscious, to puristic activity

or (B) inadequate linguistic competence consequent upon

(i) post-educational linguistic regression

or (ii) lack of linguistic education.

As the particular nature of evidence prevents us from verifying the educational background and the level of linguistic competence of individuals, the assessment of each occurrence of the plural is bound to rest on dubious speculation.

Official Correspondence

1.2.2.3.2.3. Official letters are generally free of dual forms. But there are exceptions. I offer two examples:

1. SB XIV 11344 (= P.Ryl. IV 676), a letter of AD 86 from an archprophet to an unknown high-ranking official:¹ l. 13 has $\lambda\tau\epsilon\omega\nu\ \delta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ (C 1 + -C 4; score 1+ -3 = -2);

¹ P. Parsons, *CE* 49 (1974) 154 suggested an epistrategus.

2. SB XVI 12750, a letter from village scribes to the strategus: l. 2 has τῶν] δυοῖν μερίδων (C 1 + -C 4; score 1+ -3 = -2).

Some scribes may have had limited linguistic competence, but the exceedingly frequent occurrence of plural forms even in place of the most common dual forms suggests that the latter must have been deliberately avoided in many circumstances. In favourable conditions, the dual can be shown to have been alien to the normal epistolary practice of individual bureaus in particular periods. I select for discussion two sets of letters issued by two different high-ranking official chanceries in the time of Diocletian:

(A) Significant exx. of the plural in place of the dual in letters dispatched by the strategus of the Panopolite nome in September AD 298 (P.Panop.Beatty 1):

1. ll. 120-127 (to the catholicus, 15 Sept.): l. 121 ἀμφοτέρων (-C 1);
2. ll. 160-166 (to the *magister rei privatae*, 15 Sept.): l. 160 ἀμφοτέρων (-C 1);
3. ll. 252-255 (to a lawyer, 17 Sept.): l. 252 ἄλλας δύο σκάφους [i.e. σκάφας or ἄλλα . . . σκάφη? See Skeat, *P.Panop. Beatty* p. 122] (-C 6 + -C 4);
4. ll. 272-275 (to the prefect, 18 Sept.): l. 272 ἀμφότεροι (-C 1);
5. ll. 353-364 (to the senate, 23 Sept.): l. 357 δύο ἀπαιτητάς (-C 4);
6. ll. 392-394 (to overseers of barley, 24 Sept.): μηνῶν δύο (-C 4 + -C 1);
7. ll. 395-398 (to the *decemprimi* of the Middle Toparchy, 24 Sept.): ll. 395-396 [μ]ηνῶ[ν] δύο (-C 4 + -C 1).

NB. Cf. also P.Panop.Beatty 2.43 [ἄλ]λων δύο κοιμισθεισῶν (-C 6 + -C 1 + -C 7), in a note written by the same office two years later upon receipt of an incoming letter from the procurator of the Lower Thebaid.

(B) Significant exx. of the plural in place of the dual in letters dispatched by the procurator of the Lower Thebaid in February AD 300 (P.Panop.Beatty 2):

1. ll. 80-85 (9 Feb.): l. 82 τῶν δύο πηδαλίων καὶ ἀγκυρῶν (-C 1 + -C 4 + -C 4);
2. ll. 86-91: l. 87 δύο τοὺς μάλιστα ἐντρεχεστέρους; 90 (-C 4);
3. ll. 145-152 (13 Feb.): l. 150 τῶν προειρημένων ἰν[δικτιῶν]ων δύο (-C 8 + -C 4 + -C 1);
4. ll. 285-290 (28 Feb.): l. 286 μηνῶν δύο (-C 4 + -C 1).

B1,2,4 are copies of letters addressed to the strategus of the Panopolite nome; B3 is a copy of a circular addressed to all the strategi of the Lower Thebaid: this is a copy of the exemplar received by the strategus of the Panopolite nome.

The evidence appears so coherent and extensive as to show that the dual was foreign to the normal epistolary practice of scribes employed in the office of the strategus of the Panopolite nome in AD 298 and in the office of the procurator of the Lower Thebaid two years later. The two sets of letters, however, are not homogeneous in style. The strategus' correspondence displays much simpler and more straightforward sentence structure than the procurator's letters.¹ The elaborate period construction in the latter

¹ See Skeat, *P.Panop.Beatty* (1964) p. xxxix, who suggests that the letters of the strategus 'may in the first place have been dictated'.

Chapter Three

is seemingly the result of carefully-planned composition. This suggests that the language also underwent a conscious selection process: the dual may well have been avoided deliberately. Perhaps it was deemed inappropriate to administrative correspondence. Certainly neither the prestige of the dispatching office nor that of recipients were regarded as sufficient stimuli to puristic intervention. Somewhat corroborating evidence is supplied by the letters included in list A. These were sent out to different recipients: A1 and A4 were dispatched to high-ranking officials, A5 to an important institution, A6 to low officials, A3 to a simple lawyer. Yet differently-ranked recipients did not entail changes in style and the level of puristic intensity: note the avoidance of ἄμφω/ἀμφοῖν, particularly at A1 and A4.

As all these letters are copies,¹ one or more occurrences of the plural might not be genuine. In particular, it is possible that δυοῖν or δυεῖν was originally written in place of δύο at A6, A7, B1, B3, and B4.² Two facts, however, require due consideration. Firstly, scribal banalisation is unlikely to have affected many dual forms. Secondly, the occurrences of -C 4, -C 6, and -C 8 are likely to be correct. This lends indirect support to the conclusion that the dual was foreign to the *normal* epistolary practice of the two high-ranking bureaux in the Lower Thebaid. There is no reason to believe that they represent abnormal cases. Exceptional instances of dual forms in official letters, such as those found in SB 11344 and 12750, are attributable to puristic intervention of individual scribes. The motive behind their conduct cannot be determined.

Petitions

1.2.2.3.2.4. Petitions exhibit a few examples of dual endings:

1. BGU I 256 (c. AD 137 (?)–142; Fay.), a pet. to the prefect C. Avidius Heliodorus (BL I 33): l. 5 εἰς ὄνομα δυεῖν;
2. P.Oxy. VIII 1117 (c. AD 178³), a draft pet. to a prefect: l. 16 ἐκ δυεῖν ταλάντων (score 1+ -3 = -2);
3. P.Oxy. VIII 1119 = W.Chr. 397 (AD 244), copy of a pet. from the ἄρχοντες and the βουλή of Antinoopolis to Antonius Alexander, the epistrategus of Heptanomia:⁴ l. 20 δυοῖν θάτερον;
4. CPR V 9 (AD 339; Herm.), a pet. from an inhabitant of Hermopolis to a

¹ P.Panop.Beatty 1 and 2 are two registers prepared in the office of the strategus of the Panopolite nome: the former preserves copies of outgoing correspondence, the latter copies of incoming correspondence.

² For a suggestive case of fluctuation between δυεῖν and δύο in the gen. cf. Ch. I § 3.2.1.1 (i).

³ Cf. E.P. Wegener, *P.Oxf.* (1942) pp. 7–9.

⁴ AD 253 (BL I 332, II (2) 98), though mentioned by Gignac II 188, is the date of the documents listed at ll. 2–14, and not that of the petition under consideration. Antonius Alexander: *PIR*² I 155 no. 811, D. Thomas 1982, 191. On the form of the petition see D. Thomas 1982, 115 n. 22.

Chapter Three

defensor civitatis: l. 18 δυοῖν τὸ ἕτερον.

δυοῖν θάτερον/τὸ ἕτερον (Texts 3-4) is a formulary expression and therefore does not represent a reliable indicator of deliberate puristic intervention. It may be noted that two of the three cases of δυοῖν in Gregory of Nazianzus' dual-disliking letters (§ 1.2.2.2) are occurrences of δυοῖν θάτερον (*epp.* 7.9, 90.4 Gallay, GCS). The use of -C 3 in item 2 is an indicator of moderate puristic intervention. It seems that the most uncommon dual forms were avoided in petitions. Significant evidence in favour of this conclusion is supplied by P.Oxy. XLVII 3366 (= P.Coll.Youtie II 66), a third-century papyrus which contains two consecutive draft versions of one and the same very pretentious petition to the emperors Valerian and Gallienus (AD 253-260). The petitioner described himself public grammarian of Oxyrhynchus and scholar.¹ One of the two drafts is found at ll. 1-16 (text A), the other at ll. 40-70 (text C). C seems to be a revised version of A. Dual endings were avoided whenever the petitioner addressed the two emperors. There are occurrences of -C 5, -C 6, and -C 9. This attitude manifested itself in A and was maintained in C. Considering the high level of rhetorical and linguistic refinement of the petition (§ 1.3.4 no. A2), we can undoubtedly speak of conscious disregard for the dual. However, as no examples of either C 1 or -C 1 occur, it is impossible to determine the writer's attitude to dual forms that were more frequently revived in contemporary documents.

Texts 1-2 are petitions addressed to the prefect of Egypt. If their dual forms were borrowed consciously, which we cannot prove, then the high rank of recipients may have influenced the choice.

Imperial Constitutions

1.2.2.3.2.5. Imperial constitutions offer a handful of cases of dual endings:

1. AD 47: P.Lond. III 1178.30 p. 216 = *W.Chr.* 156 (Herm.), a letter of Claudius to an athletic club of Hermopolis:² μετὰ δυεῖν θυγατέρων (score 1+ -3 = -2);
2. AD 174/175: Oliver 1989 no. 184 plaque II 66 (ἀμφοῖν + plur. [-C 4 + -C 8]), but δύο with the plur. at plaque II 10-11, 81 (-C 5); see § 1.3.5 no. D 1;
3. c. AD 253-257: P.Oxy. LI 3611.7, rescript (?) of Valerian and Gallienus: δυοῖν ἀφαιρέσεων τῶν καλουμένων (score 1+ -3+ -3 = -5).

The revival is occasional and is characterised by a mild degree of puristic intensity. Dual endings belonging to uncommon categories were avoided. Extreme purism appears

¹ For further information on the papyrus see § 1.3.4 no. A2. On the date of the petition see Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 4.

² The date mentioned by Gignac II 188 (AD 194) is incorrect, since it refers to the diploma of membership at l. 37 ff.

Chapter Three

to have had no impact on these texts. It may be noted that no. 2 exhibits several puristic items besides ἀμφοῖν, but apparently only one of them seems to have been characteristic of severe purism.¹ Intense puristic affectation was clearly avoided.

1.2.3. Conclusion

Features of *extreme* purism appear to have had a limited impact on non-literary prose. The occasional reception of markedly archaising items was essentially dependent on the personal initiative of individuals and was generally the result of deliberate puristic intervention. Conversely, there is reason to believe that they were deliberately avoided in some circumstances (see esp. §§ 1.2.1.2.3, 1.2.2.3.2.2, 1.2.2.3.2.4). Evidence of marked puristic intervention through unconscious self-censorship is found sporadically. The use of archaising forms that were taught in schools seems occasionally to have been a manifestation of this mode of puristic activity (§§ 1.2.2.3.1, 1.2.2.3.2.2). Although these forms were unassimilated in the living speech, education is likely to have enabled average writers to have greater acquaintance with them than with other obsolete items. In fact, even largely unintegrated features differ in their level of puristic intensity and the extent of propagation into usage. Dual endings of nouns, pronouns, adjectives, finite verbs, and participles are exceedingly rare, and their revival posits a desire for intense puristic affectation. Such uncommon endings are found only in very Atticising forensic oratory (§ 1.2.2.3.2.1), while they were avoided in cultivated private letters (§ 1.2.2.3.2.2), in refined petitions (§ 1.2.2.3.2.4), and in official correspondence dispatched not only by local authorities (§ 1.2.2.3.2.3) but also by the emperors (§ 1.2.3.2.5). Genre thus influenced writers. Time seems to have been an additional factor, for it seems to account for the varying attitudes to intense purism apparent in forensic oratory itself (§ 1.2.2.3.2.1).

Other markedly puristic items equally owed, or may have owed, their occasional revival to deliberate puristic intervention, but their use seems to have given performance a lower degree of puristic affectation than that supplied by the above dual forms. As a result, features such as θᾶττον and dual forms of numerals were occasionally revived in genres in which the use of more uncommon dual endings was avoided; sporadic attestations are found in private letters (§§ 1.2.1.2.3, 1.2.2.3.2.2), in petitions (§§ 1.2.1.2.4, 1.2.2.3.2.4), in official correspondence issued by local authorities (§ 1.2.2.3.2.3) and by the emperors (§§ 1.2.1.2.1, 1.2.2.3.2.5), and even in documents (§ 1.2.2.3.1). The revival appears to have been a function of each individual's desire for

¹ Cf. § 1.3.5 no. D 1.

Chapter Three

cultivated performance. Precisely because puristic intervention was dependent on individual taste, it is impossible to determine in each case which factors inspired writers. Genre may have influenced the conduct of imperial secretaries. The high rank of recipients may have played a role in petitions. Writing seems to have represented an unconscious stimulus to purism in some circumstances (§§ 1.2.2.3.1, 1.2.2.3.2.2). Other cases are uncertain.

Markedly puristic items were known to and used by a variety of people. The present selection includes advocates (§ 1.2.2.3.2.1), notaries (§ 1.2.2.3.1), clerks (or office-holders) employed in official chanceries both in Egypt (§ 1.2.2.3.2.3) and at the imperial court (§ 1.2.2.3.2.5), ex-officials (§ 1.2.1.2.4), military officers (§ 1.2.1.2.3), and common citizens (§ 1.2.2.3.1). Intense puristic affectation, however, did not appeal to a public grammarian who was to address the emperors in a self-consciously literary style (§ 1.2.2.3.2.4).

1.3. PURISTIC PROFILES

1.3.0. We can now proceed to assess the overall impact of purism on select written performances and to examine the correlation between the determinants of linguistic selection and the varying degrees of puristic intensity of sources. My chosen method of assessing profiles of puristic intensity owes much to that developed in recent years by George Thomas;¹ I have introduced a few adaptations to the specific types of sources under consideration and to the particular purpose of my investigation. Three basic levels of puristic intensity can be distinguished:

1. non-existent purism;
2. mild purism;
3. extreme purism.

As Thomas has emphasised, 'a crucial aspect of purism is the way in which puristic attitudes interact with non-puristic ones'.² My first indicator of the intensity of purism is thus the extent to which non-puristic factors are taken into consideration. Given a variety of sets of equivalent linguistic variants, one or more of which differ from the other variants in having puristic connotations, the following classification can be established:

1. non-existent purism ignores puristic variants;
2. mild purism makes concessions to puristic variants;
3. extreme purism ignores non-puristic variants.

My second indicator is the target of puristic intervention. I pointed out earlier the existence of a hierarchy of the targets of purism (§ 1.1.2). The more assimilated an item is into the contemporary linguistic system, the more intense is the purism which seeks to remove it. Conversely, the greater the degree of puristic intensity inherent in a word, the more marked is the puristic attitude of the performance which makes use of that word. In previous paragraphs (§§ 1.2.1-1.2.2), I focused on a selection of largely unintegrated items. But now I shall also take account of allegedly puristic features which were more deeply rooted into the linguistic system. The interrelationship between these two types of puristic features allows the following classification to be set:

1. non-existent purism confines to well-established, non-puristic features;
2. mild purism

¹ G. Thomas 1991, 170-175.

² G. Thomas 1991, 171.

Chapter Three

- (a) makes concessions to integrated puristic variants,
but (b) avoids unintegrated puristic variants;

3. extreme purism revives fully unassimilated puristic variants;

George Thomas also established a scale of puristic intensity on the basis of lexical targets such as loanwords, calques, and neologisms.¹ While being applicable to modern languages, this classification proves unprofitable for distinguishing between attitudes to purism in ancient Greek sources, because the archaistic character of ancient Greek purism inevitably entailed the rejection of all loanwords and calques: these ought without exception to be regarded as indicators of non-puristic attitudes. My three basic profiles of purism may thus be described as follows:

1. non-existent purism characterised by

(a) a disregard for puristic variants;

(b) a distinct preference for fully integrated non-puristic variants;

2. mild purism characterised by some consideration of puristic variants, provided they are rooted into the language system;

3. extreme purism characterised by

(a) a thorough disregard for non-puristic variants;

(b) a consistent removal of well-established features and a revival of obsolete variants.

This classification, however, presupposes a largely simplified representation of reality. Modern linguists have often distinguished between mild and moderate purism, and after reading through a substantial body of ancient sources, I obtained a feeling for the existence of differences *within* a predominantly medium degree of puristic intensity. The problem, however, is not to force such putative differences to appear to convey what in fact they are unable to do. Papyri barely allow them to be set into a precise scale of puristic intensity, which may provide the reader with an independent objective assessment of their implications as to the impact of purism. As a result, I believe that it would be unwise to construct more detailed patterns than the one established above. Let us consider, for instance, my first criterion of puristic intensity. George Thomas, who has made a ground-breaking attempt to define stages in puristic intensity, proposed to regard mild purism as characterised by an equal consideration of non-puristic factors, and moderate purism by some concessions to these factors.² Given the excessive brevity of Greek non-literary texts, and in view of the fact that an exceedingly low number of written papers have survived from the entire non-literary production of each individual

¹ G. Thomas 1991, 172-173; cf. also *ibid.* 68-74.

² G. Thomas 1991, 171, 173.

Chapter Three

(Ch. I § 3.1.3), no trust can be placed in word-frequency as a criterion of minute distinction between puristic attitudes which can be ranked midway between non-puristic orientations and extreme purism. I thus prefer using the terms 'mild' and 'moderate' as synonyms. Differences apparent within profile 2 above will be described rather than terminologised by means of words corresponding to dubiously-defined categories.

Ancient sources also document the existence of mixed profiles characterised by a blend of non-puristic factors and high profile items. The ratio between these contrasting elements fluctuates considerably so that the impact of purism presents variable degrees of intensity. Some of those profiles can be described as high level profiles defaced by occasional lapses into non-puristic Greek, whereas others look rather like moderate profiles embellished by an occasional display of eye-catching puristic colouring.

As expected, several factors seem to have influenced the selection of the profile. For convenience, evidence will be discussed genre by genre.

Forensic Oratory and Court-Room Performance

1.3.1. It is often hard to tell whether a rhetorical papyrus fragment comes from an unknown classical oration or from a forensic speech composed in the Roman period. A number of oratorical papyri of secure Roman date, however, do exist. They show that purism had no homogeneous impact even on a genre, such as forensic oratory, which generally required writers to undertake much puristic censorship.

1.3.1.1. P.Lond.Lit. 138 (Pack² 2515) contains three legal pleas written in the first century AD on the back of a composite roll made up of several originally distinct pieces of papyrus; the roll was very probably manufactured to receive the orations.¹ These writings seem to be autograph compositions,² perhaps by the same man as the one who made up the roll. As the addressee of three of the re-used documents is a certain Acusilaus, the sitologus of two villages of Fayum, the author of the orations is likely to have been either Acusilaus himself or a young relative — the speeches may have been exercises made on the basis of set themes. The puristic profile of the best-preserved of these orations (cols. iii 5 - v 37³) has the following characteristics:

¹ Cf. Kenyon, *P.Lond.* II (1898) xxiv, 95-96.

² Cf. Milne, *P.Lond.Lit.* (1927) p. 101. The papyrus, however, is not included in the most recent lists of autograph prose manuscripts from Graeco-Roman Egypt, see M.G. Parca, *Ptocheia or Odysseus in Disguise at Troy (P.Köln VI 245)* (Am. Stud. in Pap. 31, Atlanta 1991) 3-4 n. 7; T. Dorandi, *ZPE* 87 (1991) 19-20; D. Manetti, *ZPE* 100 (1994) 48.

³ Full transcript: *P.Lond.Lit.* (1927) pp. 104-111. Partial editions (col. iii 5-44 only): F.G. Kenyon, *Mélanges Henri Weil* (Paris 1898) 245-247; K. Jander, *Oratorum et rhetorum Graecorum fragmenta nuper reperta* (Bonn 1913) 23-25.

Chapter Three

(A) Puristic variants:

1. mild usage of the dual in line with contemporary Atticising literature (§ 1.2.2.3.2.1);
2. 6 cases of ττ (iii 14, 36, 42, 43, iv 3, v 21 [ῥττονα]);

(B) Non-puristic variants:

1. 2 cases of cc (iii 26, iv 13 [ῥσσονος]);
2. εἰπας (iii 35), cf. Appendix (B) § 1.3 no. 8;

(C) A feature of uncertain puristic value: ἐωνεῖτο (iii 19).

Ancient discussions of this verb include Phryn. *Ecl.* 108 Fischer, [Herod.] *Philet.* 72 Dain, Ael. Dion. ε 59 Erbse, *Schol.* Aristoph. *Plut.* 7c Chantry (~ *Sud.* ε 1889 Adler). These purists accepted only those forms of the verb ὠνεῖσθαι for which no equivalent form of πρίασθαι was available. They agreed on proscribing the aor. ind. of ὠνεῖσθαι (Phryn., Ps-Herod., Ael. Dion.) and seemingly the aor. participle (Phryn., *Schol.* Aristoph. [*Sud.*]). Pseudo-Herodian also condemned the aor. inf. The perf. participle was accepted by Phrynichus but not (apparently) by Aelius Dionysius. No information on ἐωνεῖτο is available; whether ἐπρίατο represented an equivalent form it is hard to tell. The perf. ind., too, raises problems. ἐώνημαι was accepted by Pseudo-Herodian because of the lack of an equivalent perfect form of πρίασθαι. By contrast, Phrynichus advised writers to replace it with ἐπριάμην. Evidently he considered the two forms equivalent. This is surprising, unless he was thinking of cases of aoristic perfect. The example advanced (ἐώνημαι / ἐπριάμην οἰκίαν) seems consistent with this hypothesis. It remains uncertain whether the compiler of *Philetaerus* also approved of the aoristic use of ἐώνημαι.

If the oration is an autograph composition, then all these readings (including B 1 and B 2) are genuine. Together, they produce a mixed puristic profile. It is unclear whether the use of such well-integrated non-puristic ingredients as B 1 and B 2 stems from the influence of contemporary literary Greek, which generally favoured moderate purism, or from mere faults on the part of the (young ?) writer. Perhaps both factors played a role.

1.3.1.2. Unlike this oration, P. Giss. I 99, a speech composed to be delivered by an advocate before a law court at Hermopolis in the second or third century, is characterised by an extreme degree of puristic intensity. Unintegrated dual forms were

Chapter Three

revived with unusual consistency (§ 1.2.2.3.2.1). Use was made of the obsolete Attic declension (ll. 16-17 τοῦ (ν)εώ), which — rare epigraphic instances apart — was confined to highly Atticising literary prose.¹ ττ was respected (l. 9). The author also seems to have imitated the style of classical Athenian oratory. As Crönert has pointed out,² he used a formula characteristic of Attic oratorical style for citing a document in support of his pleaded thesis (ll. 20-29) and for asking it to be read aloud to the audience (ll. 18-19).³ In particular, he seems to have imitated Demosthenes:

P.Giss. 99.18-19	καί μοι λαβὼν ἀνά[γν]ωθι . . . τὰ ἀντίγραφα
Dem. 57.31	καί μοι λαβὼν ἀνάγνωθι πρῶτον τὸν Σόλωνος νόμον
Dem. 21.52	ἀνάγνωθι δέ μοι λαβὼν αὐτὰς τὰς μαντείας
Dem. 24.32	ἀνάγνωθι δέ μοι λαβὼν τοῦτον τὸν νόμον

Additionally, note the use of the passive of ἰδρύω to mean 'erected' (l. 16), for which parallels can be found in classical Greek (LSJ s.v. II). βασιλί[σσης] (l. 21) is the only non-puristic item which occurs in this oration,⁴ but it is found in a quotation from a Ptolemaic document.

Such an extreme puristic profile reflects the severe puristic orientation of second- and early third-century Atticists, and would have been unthought-of before approximately the end of the first century AD.⁵ It was clearly chosen from among many alternatives to comply with the puristic regulations which all serious orators of the period were required to observe. The selection of the profile is thus a direct function of genre and an indirect function of time.

1.3.1.3. In late antiquity, the final version of the oratorical speech to be delivered in the law court was based on preliminary notes on the legal case to be discussed. A group of fourth-century papyri, the so-called '*Narratio*' documents, not

¹ Isolated cases of νεός, νεώ are found in inscriptions from Roman Attica (Threatte II 40 ['in the Roman period νεός was clearly normal in prose. A single case of νεών in a prose dedication is surprising and is probably a learned spelling'], 42), and Roman Pergamum (Schweizer 1898, 142-143, but the only ex. cited occurs in a metrical inscription). Atticists: Schmid I 226-227 (Lucian and Aelius Aristides), III 25 (Aelian), IV 20 (Philostratus). No other example is found in Roman papyri: cf. Gignac II 30-31 (compounds such as νεωκόρος, νεωκορία are not relevant). A single case of τοῦ νεώ is attested for the Ptolemaic period, probably as a deliberate archaism (Mayser I 2, p. 15. 27-29).

² Cf. Crönert ap. P.M. Meyer, *Klio* 8 (1908) 429.

³ The practice of reading aloud documents during court-room proceedings is attested for classical Athens but was retained in Graeco-Roman Egypt, see e.g. P.Abinn. 63.4,17, a copy of a minute of proceedings before the *iuridicus* of Alexandria, dated AD 350. Cf. in general Coles 1966, 47-48.

⁴ Non-puristic, anyway, if we follow Phrynichus, since other lexicographers regarded βασιλίσσα as a good puristic word. On this controversy see Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.3.3.

⁵ Although the date of composition of the speech may not coincide with the date of the manuscript, I believe that the former is not much earlier than the latter.

only shows that the style of these notes was considerably variable from individual to individual, but also illustrates the varying effects of purism on such unfinished pieces of prose.¹ Almost each papyrus consists of (a) minutes providing a presentation of a case at law, and (b) highlights taken from these minutes but penned in a different hand. While it is generally agreed that (b) was the work of a rhetor, the exact authorship of part (a) is debated. Two major hypotheses have been advanced:

- (i) that it too was usually drawn up by a rhetor. Part (b) would thus represent a memorandum for personal use during court-room proceedings;
- (ii) that it represents the preliminary work of a νομικός. Part (b) would contain the notes which the advocate selected for oral presentation from the material put by the νομικός at his disposal.²

The latter offers an appropriate context for the palaeographical difference between the two parts. In any case, there is evidence to show that even part (a) cannot represent a finished composition, but a preliminary arrangement of the main arguments to be advanced in court.³ The extant examples of (a) differ in their level of stylistic and linguistic refinement. Four items can be singled out for consideration.

(A) SB XII 10989 = P.Princ. III 119 (c. AD 325). The main presentation (ll. 3-5) opens with a gnomic preamble characterised by a distinct rhetorical style: note the use of chiasmus (τοὺς περιεργαζομένους τὰς ἀλλοτρίας κτήσεις καὶ ἑνδιξιν [ἐπι]-χωροῦντας) and the cumulation of parallelism, polyptoton, and paronomasia (μισοῦσιν μὲν οἱ νόμοι, μισεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ σὴ μισοπονηρία). The subsequent narrative displays no such pervasively rhetorical construction, but carelessness seems to have been avoided. The structure of the period running from l. 11 to 13 (ἐτέραν δὲ γῆν . . . ἡμέρωσεν καὶ ἐγεώργη [l. -γει] καὶ τὴν νομὴν εἶχεν) closely resembles Isae. 9.28 (τὸ τοίνυν χωρίον . . . ἐφύτευσε καὶ ἐγεώργει καὶ ἐποίει διπλασίου ἄξιον), which is also very similar in content. The writer may well have imitated this passage. While not relaxing discipline altogether, he seems to have sought a polished form which might suit the

¹ For a recent list of published items and bibliographic references see A. Papathomas, *P.Heid.* VII (1996) p. 150.

² Hypothesis (i): Hanson 1971, esp. 16; cf. L.C. Youtie - D. Hagedorn - H.C. Youtie, *ZPE* 10 (1973) 150. Hypothesis (ii): Sijpesteijn-Worp 1978, 117-118; R.S. Bagnall, *P.Col.* VII p. 167. On the status and activities of *nomikoi* see W. Kunkel, *Herkunft und soziale Stellung des römischen Juristen* 2. Aufl. (Cologne 1967); Kleijwegt 1991, 173-181.

³ This conclusion can be inferred from SB XII 10989. 43-44 (= P.Princ. III 119) εἰς ἀν λέγει . . . ἢ ἐρ(οῦμεν) κτλ. 'should he (the opponent) say . . . , we shall argue . . . '. Evidently the writer suggests adapting the final version of the speech to the steps taken by the opposing party.

narrative context.¹

The puristic profile of the text is characterised by:

(I) a number of puristic features:

1. ἄχρι (l. 14), cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.3.3;
2. a case of ττ (l. 35);
3. the use of the adv. τέως 'meanwhile' (l. 52) without the article and preposition (that is, simple τέως instead of ἐν τῷ τέως), cf. [Herod.] *Philet.* 7 Dain.

(II) consistent avoidance of unusual dual forms (the writer acts on behalf of two individuals) (no examples of -C 1-4 occur).

(III) a feature of uncertain classification, viz. ἐώνηται (l. 10).²

This mixed puristic profile reflects the composite structure of the language. The construction of passive ἐπιδείκνυσθαι with the supplementary participle (l. 5 ἐπιδιχθήσεται [l. ἐπιδειχ-] πεποιηκώς) is an element of educated speech. Dem. 21.160 δειχθήσεται τοῦτο πεποιηκώς offers a close parallel.³ On the other hand, the letter displays several characteristics of post-classical Greek. The augment in καταναλίσκω has the form κατανήλωσ- (ll. 10-11) in place of class. κατηνάλωσ-.⁴ A periphrastic future occurs at ll. 6-7 (τῶν μελλόντων ῥηθή[ε]σθαι = τῶν ῥηθησομένων).⁵ The verb καταφυτεύω (unclass.) was consistently used (ll. 11,26-27,29-30). Classical Greek offered φυτεύω; an occurrence is found even in the passage from Isaeus 9.28 which the writer may have imitated in the period following upon the first attestation of καταφυτεύω. It may also be noted that the verb καταφυτεύω is elsewhere construed with the simple instrumental dative, and not with ἐν + dat. This is a further lapse into contemporary

¹ Perhaps even the cumulation of καί's linking three main clauses at ll. 10-11 should not be taken as an indicator of carelessness.

² Ancient purists were divided as to the recognition of ἐώνημαι as puristic (§ 1.3.1.1 no. (C)). Phrynichus seems to have condemned the aoristic use of such perfect forms. In this case, the perfect clearly denotes a past action ('he bought'), cf. the sequence ἀπεγράψατο (8) . . . ἐώνηται (10) . . . κατανήλωσεν (10-11) . . . κατεφύτευσεν (11). This fact, however, is not a sufficient proof of non-puristic status for the form. As we have seen, it is unclear whether the compiler of *Philetaerus* approved of ἐώνημαι irrespective of the function performed by the perfect, or made an exception for aoristic perfect. If the former is the case, then the author of SB 10989 might have even shared his views.

³ Cf. Hanson 1971, 25 *ad loc.* For a somewhat similar phrase see P.Lips. 64.46 (c. AD 368) εἰ μὴ ὀφθείης τοῦτο πεποιηκώς. Cf. § 1.3.1.3.1.

⁴ On this augment in Attic see Veitch 1887, 356-357 s.v. καταναλίσκω; Kühner-Blass II 367. MSS of Koine literary texts often fluctuate between the two forms: cf. e.g. Inglese 1996, 151.

⁵ On this future periphrasis see Browning 1983, 33 and Mandilaras 1973 § 377 (uninformative). In the present case, the use of the future infinitive in place of ῥηθῆναι is remarkable.

usage.¹

(B) SB XII 11224 (c. AD 329). The text is characterised by simple word order and unartificial sentence construction.² A case of cc is found at l. 8.

(C) SB XIV 11717 (mid iv AD). Col. ii exhibits clear traces of linguistic cultivation, including loans from poetic language (§ 2.2.2). Two cases of ἐώνηται are found at ll. 17 and 23. The absence of information on the writer's chosen criteria of good puristic usage makes it difficult to assess the puristic profile of the composition on the basis of such evidence. Elements of poetic language were frequently used in literary prose of both puristic and non-puristic character (cf. § 2.0). In this papyrus, the choice of poetic diction seems to have been a specific function of context (§ 2.2.2) and may well have been unrelated to the writer's attitude to purism. Moreover, the ancient controversies about the puristic value of ἐώνημαι (§ 1.3.1.1 no. C) make it hard to tell whether the form struck the writer as puristic or not.

(D) P. Col. VII 174 (after AD 323 [342 ?]). The text is characterised by simple word order (cf. e.g. the SVO-order at ll. 10-12) and unartificial sentence construction. The use of initial ἀλλά instead of δέ at l. 5 is a further indication of careless conduct. Although acting on behalf of two people, the writer consistently preferred plural forms to dual endings of uncommon type: cf. ll. 8-9 Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ καὶ Ἡρακλᾶ . . . ἀπογραψαμένων (-C 8; score -2).³ A feature of late Greek is the use of a compound verb in place of a simple (l. 6 ἀπομένω instead of μένω).⁴

The man who wrote (A) practised self-censorship while drafting the text. It is impossible to tell whether the lack of thoroughness in his puristic performance is a function of the unfinished state of composition, or of his puristic attitude, or indeed of both factors. If the writer was a rhetor, he may have planned to undertake stylistic revision at a later stage. But if he was a *nomikos*, he may have expected the rhetor to perform this task before delivering his speech in court, and may therefore have contented himself with puristic colouring. Whoever the 'reviser' was, he could have altered the augment of κατανήλωσεν and could have replaced ἐώνηται and the periphrastic future. But the use of very unusual dual forms might have been beyond his accepted boundary of puristic affectation: even contemporary oratory seems to have avoided dual forms of pronouns and finite verbs (§ 1.2.2.2). Similar considerations apply

¹ On ἐν + dat. for instrumental dative in Koine Greek see especially Humbert 1930, 99-158.

² A long period running from l. B 7 to l. B 12 is composed of four main verbs linked together by simple καί's.

³ No example of (-)C 1-4 occurs.

⁴ Cf. Appendix (B) § 1.4 D (b) no. 5.

to (B) and (D). Their unpretentious style may depend on the provisional character of the minutes and their function as mere memoranda. The use of a well-integrated non-puristic feature in (B) may thus be the result of the unfinished state of composition. But just as in (A), the absence of uncommon dual forms in (D) probably reflects the writer's puristic attitude. Certain of the constituent elements of (C), on the other hand, presuppose a remarkable level of linguistic premeditation. A form such as *ἐώνηται* may thus owe its presence in the text either to a conscious act of disregard for purism or to a mild puristic orientation, or may have even slipped through for lack of vigilance.

It is remarkable that awareness of the provisional character of the minutes did not hinder writers from making attempts at refined composition. If they were rhetors, they may have conceived their minutes as draft versions of the speeches to be delivered in court, and therefore may have thought it fitting to undertake preliminary linguistic refinement. But what if they were *nomikoi*? Did they want to show off so as favourably to impress the rhetors for whom their minutes were being prepared? Texts (A) and (C) would supply important evidence of rhetorical qualifications of *nomikoi*.¹ In any case, it is interesting to note that even forms of provisional prose composition entailed a variety of individual responses to the problem of language selection. This is all the more significant given the remarkable homogeneity of context: all the documents belong to the same genre, all are very close in date, and all were written by individuals occupied with the same profession.

1.3.1.3.1. Written records of verbal performances delivered in law courts of Graeco-Roman Egypt are preserved in numerous papyri which contain reports of judicial proceedings. It is uncertain, however, whether these sources provide reliable information on the language used by the parties and the presiding officials. Many details of the recording procedure of court-room proceedings are unclear, and it is hard to tell whether utterances were recorded both integrally and accurately.² As Revel Coles has observed, the style of quotations in papyrus reports, 'whether it has a verbatim feel or not, could be entirely due to remodelling'.³

Judging from these documents, the way the presiding officials spoke varied considerably in terms of degree of formality and puristic intensity. The records preserved in P.Berl. Zill. 4 (iv AD), for instance, would show that the *comes* and *praeses* of the Thebaid Fl. Strategius sought to keep the standard of performance above the level of common parlance. He adopted the corresponsive particles *τε . . . καί* 'not only . . . but

¹ On education of young lawyers see Kleijwegt 1991, 181-186.

² For a discussion of these issues see Coles 1966, 15-27.

³ Coles 1966, 17 n. 1.

also' (l. 14 τὰ τε . . . καὶ τὰ) where less polished utterances would have used simple καί.¹ His linguistic performance appears to have comprised several elements of educated speech. Notable examples are pass. δείκνυσθαι with the supplementary participle (l. 23 δειχθεῖν κοινωνῶν ὧν)² and the consistent use of the potential optative in hypothetical protases followed by apodotes in the future (ll. 16-17, 23-24, 26-27). This type of conditional clause was employed in classical Greek³ and was revived in post-Hellenistic written Koine, inclusive of the non-literary strata: occasional instances are found in Roman and late Roman papyri, but it became more popular in the Byzantine period.⁴ Strategius' performance is also characterised by a remarkable puristic profile. τήμερον, a mark of intense Atticising pretension (§ 1.3.2), is found at l. 12. Line 17 exhibits a contract future (φροντιεῖ), which Moeris accepted as puristic (193.13, 202.33; cf. 200.26 Bekker). However, although missing in the NT, this formation is still frequently retained in Roman and Byzantine papyri, though comparatively less often than in Ptolemaic papyri.⁵ φροντιεῖ is a reliable indicator of educated speech, but is not necessarily the result of deliberate puristic intervention. The only non-puristic feature in Strategius' performance is cc at l. 10 (τέσσαρας).

M.Chr. 372 (AD 142-143), on the other hand, credits the prefect C. Valerius Eudaemon (in office AD 142-143⁶) with the use of a much more relaxed style in a similar circumstance. His language ignores extreme purism: note ἔφης instead of ἔφησθα (col. v 11) and σήμερον for τήμερον (v 3).⁷ Even vulgar features are put into his mouth: cf. μητέραν for μητέρα (v 2).⁸ Such casual linguistic behaviour is surprising not only because Eudaemon was a literary man (§ 1.3.5), but also because a distinct puristic profile is found in a decree issued during his tenure of the prefecture (§ 1.3.6). The crucial problem is to detect the factors which shaped performance. There are several possible explanations for the use of ἔφης and σήμερον. They may have slipped

¹ For classical parallels see *GP*² 515. On τε . . . καί in the NT and (Ptolemaic) papyri see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 444,2; Mayser II 3, p. 159-164.

² Cf. § 1.3.1.3. Mandilaras 1973 § 893 is unfortunately uninformative.

³ Cf. Kühner-Gerth II 478.

⁴ Cf. Horn 1926, 161-169; Mandilaras 1973 §§ 649-650.

⁵ Roman and Byzantine papyri: Mandilaras 1973 § 357; Gignac II 285-287. NT: Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 74,1.

⁶ Cf. § 1.3.6 with bibliography.

⁷ ἔφης / ἔφησθα: § 1.3.4 no. B1(i). On σήμερον / τήμερον see § 1.3.2. Another element relevant to purism would be ἐχθές (iv 20, v 4,11), but given the ancient controversies about the puristic acceptability of the form (cf. the sources collected by Alpers 1981, 223) it resists firm classification.

⁸ On the transfer of 3rd declension nouns to the 1st declension see Appendix (B) § 1.7 A no. 2.

through for lack of vigilance. Recent investigators of purism have shown that even purists active in modern societies have occasionally failed to reflect their proposed reforms in their own usage; 'the contrast between theory and practice can on occasion be quite stark'.¹ Rigorous consistency was alien to the puristic practice of the Atticists themselves. Occasional occurrences of σήμερον are found in Lucian and Philostratus (§ 1.3.2). Lucian and Aelius Aristides used ἔφης side by side with ἔφησθα (§ 1.3.4 no. B1(i)). Eudaemon might also have deemed ἔφης to be acceptable in formal speech. Moreover, the use of ἔφης and σήμερον represented an act of resistance to intense purism but not necessarily to purism *tout court*. That a man of letters like Eudaemon failed to make a display of severe puristic affectation in a formal setting is not to be wondered at. Phrynichus, for instance, criticised the non-puristic practice of contemporary orators in law courts.² Finally, ἔφης could be even defended as puristic. Phrynichus acknowledged the existence of occasional attestations of the form παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις. These parallels might have been regarded by Eudaemon as sufficient proofs of puristic acceptability for ἔφης.³

On the other hand, it is barely conceivable that a literary man like him made use of vulgar features in a formal setting. That he made this choice to facilitate comprehension is out of the question: compared with μητέρα, μητέραν does not improve the intelligibility of the message. Eudaemon's own performance may in fact have been remodelled and banalised in the course of preparing the report. The papyrus may not preserve his *ipsissima verba*, let alone their precise style. This fact raises crucial issues. To what extent is the papyrus a reliable source for Eudaemon's puristic attitude? Consequently, is the transmitted style of Strategius' speech genuine? It is hard to tell. As regards Strategius, an original τέτταρας or τέσσαρας may have been inadvertently altered to τέσσερας by the professional scribe who penned the papyrus. But this may not have been the same person as the man who put together the records for the preparation of the official copy of the report. Consequently, the original style of Strategius' performance might have been disfigured by multi-stage corruption, thus: Stage 1: Strategius speaks in court → Stage 2: his speech is recorded; inaccuracies are entered in places → Stage 3: a scribe 'improves' the style and the language of Strategius' recorded utterances while preparing the official copy of the report of proceedings → Stage 4: another scribe who is to make a copy of this official text banalises his model. It follows that P.Berl.Zill. 4, whether it represents stage 3 or 4, may

¹ Cf. G. Thomas 1991, 176.

² Cf. *Ecl.* 89, 91, 289, 357 Fischer.

³ For such problems in the evaluation of evidence see Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5.

Chapter Three

not be a reliable source for Strategius' performance.

Declamations

1.3.2. Declamations display widely varied puristic profiles. I shall focus on two third-century papyri. The short piece preserved in P.Oxy. XVII 2084 and entitled *Encomium on the fig*¹ exhibits quantitative clausulae, an allusion to Hom. *Il.* 1.247-49 (l. 33), and a remarkable puristic profile. This comprises:

(A) puristic variants:

1. θᾶπτον (l. 30);
2. τήμερον (l. 10) (cf. Moer. 210.16 Bekker);
3. ττ (ll. 30, 32).

(B) a non-puristic variant such as σήμερον (l. 23);

(C) a case of uncertain classification, viz. κᾶγώ (l. 8).²

A 1 and A 2 seem to have enjoyed very limited re-integration into the living linguistic system; their revival was generally a manifestation of conscious puristic intervention.

On θᾶπτον see § 1.2.1. Ratio of τήμερον : σήμερον in select writers of the late first to third centuries AD: NT: 0:41.³ Novelists: Chariton: 0:5; Longus: 1:0; Achilles Tatius: 1:1. Atticists: Lucian: 41:3; Aelius Aristides: 8:0;⁴ Philostratus: 26:3 (cf. Schmid IV 232).

Items included in list A thus point to an extreme puristic profile. It is unclear whether B slipped through for lack of vigilance or scribal inaccuracy. If the reading is genuine, the accidental offence against purism may be as insignificant as the occasional cases of σήμερον in Lucian and Philostratus.

A very different profile is found surprisingly in P.Oxy. XLV 3235, a 'Demosthenic' declamation preserved by another third-century Oxyrhynchus papyrus. The manuscript exhibits two well-integrated features which were proscribed by purists, viz. ἑαυτοῖς for ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς (fr. 1 i 4) and ἄχρις for ἄχρι

¹ Pack² 2527. The identity of the author is unknown.

² This crasis was condemned by Herod. *Περὶ τῶν ζητουμ.* 74 Dain, but apparently other authorities (including Lucian) regarded κᾶτα as a good Attic feature (Luc. *Lexiph.* 21, *Rhet. praec.* 16; cf. also Schmid II 251, IV 472 n. 59). Note the frequent occurrences of all types of crasis, including κᾶγώ, in the Atticists: cf. Schmid I 59, 198, 404 (the latter includes a case of κᾶγώ), II 252 (with information on κᾶγώ), III 295-296, IV 472-475 (474 on κᾶγώ).

³ Cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 34,1; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. σήμερον.

⁴ Some exx. are listed by Schmid IV 232.

(fr. 2 ii 12).¹ Purism would seem to have had no impact on a piece of literary prose which was composed in imitation of Demosthenes. The author, however, might have regarded those elements as acceptable. As we have seen (Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.3.3), ἄχρῖς might stem from the influence of wrong readings in his manuscript of Demosthenes, while ἐαυτοῖς might have been considered puristic on the basis of its occasional attestations in classical Greek. It is thus unclear whether the presumed non-puristic profile of the declamation originated from inadequate mastery of language or from the interaction of a misguided attempt to imitate Demosthenes and a notion of language purity unrecorded in the surviving sources.

Private Correspondence

1.3.3. Private correspondence offers widely diverging puristic profiles. The following classified presentation of select letters represents an attempt to illustrate the main tendencies and the difficulties inherent in the evaluation of evidence.

(I) Very high puristic profiles are unrepresented in papyrus letters. P.Herm. 2 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 7), an early fourth-century Hermopolis letter written in a very pretentious language (Ch. IV § 1.3.4.1), represents the nearest approximation to extreme purism. The writer adopted several puristic variants. These comprise not only well-integrated elements but also high profile items such as οἶσθα (l. 3) and ἀμύπτω (l. 13). The use of οἶσθα instead of οἶδας complies with the rule proposed by such strict purists as Aelius Dionysius (o 11 Erbse) and Moeris (205.6 Bekker).² It also provides the language of the letter with marked puristic affectation. οἶδας was the standard form in Koine Greek, especially in unpretentious prose,³ while οἶσθα was characteristic of Atticising prose. It is found in second- and third-century Atticists, for example, although even they did not avoid οἶδας altogether.⁴ Epistolographers active in the later

¹ On these features see Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.3.3.

² Cf. also Phot. *Lex.* II 8 Naber (the gloss is derived from Aelius Dionysius). οἶδας is labelled as 'Attic' in Herod. II 559.13 Lentz = Hesych. o 396 Latte.

³ *LXX*: Helbing 1907, 108. *NT*: Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 99,2; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich 558 s.v. οἶδα. Apostolic Fathers and apocryphal gospels: Reinhold, *De Graecitate patrum apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum novi testamenti quaestiones gramm.* (Diss. Halle 1898) 92. Ptolemaic papyri: Mayser I 2, p. 81.18-20. Rom. and Byz. papyri: Gignac II 409 (on another case of οἶσθα see § 1.3.4 (A 3)). Byz. chronicles: Psaltes 1913, 241. Cf. also Lobeck 1820, 236-237.

⁴ See Schmid I 85 (Dio Chrys.), 232 (Lucian), IV 38 (Philostratus). Aelian has 3 cases of οἶσθα. A sample search through book 4 of Alciphron's Atticising fictitious letters (ed. Benner-Fobes) has produced 6 exx. of οἶσθα (17.4,10; 18.4; 19.1,11,19) versus 3 exx. of οἶδας (2.1; 7.2; 13.13). Cf. also Crönert 1903, 270 with n. 2.

Chapter Three

part of the fourth century or in the first half of the fifth — that is, only few decades after P.Herm. 2 — welcomed οἶσθα, but the extent of reception varied according to their puristic orientation. The comparative frequency of οἶσθα : οἶδας in their letters is an excellent illustration of this tendency:

Libanius: 131:0

Gregory of Nazianzus: 3:6

Basil of Caesarea: 2:19

Synesius: 13:0

Firmus of Caesarea: 2:0

Similarly, the use of ἀρμόττω in place of ἀρμόζω conforms to the practice of strict Atticists and clashes with standard Koine.¹ The ratio of ἀρμόττω : ἀρμόζω (including compounds) in late antique letter-writing shows that the non-puristic variant was the preferential form of writers of mild puristic orientation:

Libanius: 1:0

Gregory of Nazianzus: 0:2

Basil of Caesarea: 1:9

Some cases of ἀρμόττ- have also surfaced in sixth- and early eighth-century papyri.² It may be noted that two of them are found in a very elaborate will composed by Dioscorus of Aphrodito in AD 570,³ and therefore represent cases of deliberate puristic intervention.⁴

In addition to these high profile items, P.Herm. 2 displays two features characteristic of all types of puristic orientation: (i) ττ for cc (l. 11); (ii) γίνονται for γίνονται (l. 22). The spelling γίνν-, in particular, was recommended by Moer. 193.23 Bekker and Eust. 1722.55. Authors variously employed both the puristic and the non-puristic variants. As a rule, however, usage in relation to the general conduct of writers cannot be defined on the basis of mere word-frequency. The pronounced liability of each spelling to scribal alteration makes it impossible to determine whether single occurrences of each variant in written sources are genuine readings.

The consistent use of puristic elements, including largely unintegrated variants, provides the letter with a high level profile. Admittedly, it is unclear whether the verb ἀποδημέω (l. 15) should be regarded as puristic, just as the corresponding noun (cf. II A below), or as non-puristic, as the corresponding adjective (Moer. 195.34 Bekker). But this uncertainty does not significantly affect the profile configuration.

(II) Other refined letters exhibit linguistic evidence relevant to purism, but the precise impact of puristic intervention on performance cannot be assessed. The

¹ Atticists: Schmid I 52, 109; II 82-83, 85; IV 137, 277; yet Aelian used both forms, see Schmid III 104. Early Christian literature: Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 101. Papyri: Mandilaras 1973 § 156; Gignac II 271-272.

² See Mandilaras 1973 § 156; Gignac II 272.

³ P.Cair.Masp. II 67151.150,274. On the style cf. MacCoull 1988, 50-54; § 2.2.4.1 below.

⁴ On this phenomenon in contracts see § 1.2.2.3.1.

absence of information on the writers' accepted criteria of good puristic usage does not allow many linguistic items to be classified with accuracy. Two cases deserve consideration.

(A) P.Herm. 6 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 11), an early fourth-century pretentious letter from the same archive as P.Herm. 2,¹ displays a number of puristic features characterised by various degrees of integration into the linguistic system. The adverb ἐκάστοτε was used in place of πάντοτε (l. 12) in conformity with the puristic requirement stated by Phryn. *Ecl.* 74 Fischer, Moer. 207.27 Bekker, Orus A 70 Alpers, and *Suda* ε 357 Adler. In Koine, ἐκάστοτε seems to have been used less frequently than πάντοτε.² In the same way, the lexeme ἀποδημία was preferred to ἐκδημία (l. 7) (cf. Antiatt. 93.26). Both forms are attested in classical Greek³ and in Koine, but ἀποδημία prevailed over ἐκδημία in both periods, even in non-literary prose. On the other hand, the letter exhibits a well-integrated item of uncertain classification, viz. καμύειν for καταμύειν (l. 8). The syncopated form was proscribed by Phryn. *Ecl.* 316 Fischer, but not by milder purists (cf. Antiatt. 103.27 Bekker). It is well attested in unpretentious Koine.⁴ If the sender accepted this form as puristic, then the text would exhibit thorough acceptance of puristic features. This is a characteristic of extreme purism. However, in the absence of complementary indicators of the writer's attitude to high profile items, it is hard to tell whether he really aimed to produce a high-level puristic profile. If, on the other hand, καμύειν represents a concession to non-puristic Greek, the profile should be described as mild.

(B) P.Herm. 5 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 10 = Tibiletti 1979 no. 27), another early fourth-century pretentious letter from the same archive as the previous papyri,⁵ exhibits a puristic feature such as ττ (l. 18), a well-integrated non-puristic variant such as γιν- for γινν- (l. 7) (cf. (I) above), and an element of uncertain classification, viz. εὐκταῖος for εὐκτός (l. 8). The lexeme εὐκτός was accepted by authorities of various puristic orientations: cf. Poll. 5.130, Moer. 195.21 Bekker, and Orus A 49 Alpers. Pollux, however, labelled εὐκτός as 'more Attic' (ἄττικώτερον) than εὐκταῖος. He thus credited

¹ On the language and style of P.Herm. 6 see Ch. IV § 1.3.4.2.

² Bibliography on these items will be found in Alpers 1981, 186; add Hernandez Lara 1994, 153-154. On πάντοτε see also W. Schmid, *PhW* 54 (1934) 941-942. It may be noted that this word is found even in Atticising writers: Dio Chrysostom (Schmid I 161) and John Chrysostom's classicising writings (Fabricius 1962, 108) are good examples.

³ But ἐκδημία is much rarer. In Plat. *Leg.* 950 e, both forms are used in one and the same phrase for the sake of variation. On recurrence and variety in classical Greek see Dover 1997, 131-159.

⁴ See Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v.; Rutherford 1881, 427.

⁵ On the language and style of P.Herm. 5 see Ch. IV § 1.3.4.3.

εὐκταῖος with a mild puristic connotation. Moeris and Orus also acknowledged the existence of an occurrence of the proscribed form in Plato's *Laws*,¹ where it seems to have the same meaning as the present attestation. It follows that the individual who wrote P.Herm. 5 might have regarded εὐκταῖος as puristic. This uncertainty has a serious bearing on the assessment of the impact of puristic intervention.

(III) Several refined letters are characterised by a more moderate profile than P.Herm. 2 (I). In this section, I shall focus on three items which differ in their strategies of stylistic refinement.

(A) The individual who wrote P.Ryl. IV 624 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 4), an early fourth-century pretentious letter,² practised very mild self-censorship. He preferred the form χάριν (l. 5) to χάριτα in compliance with the rules of Atticism (cf. Moer. 213.23 Bekker). χάριν contributes light puristic colouring, inasmuch as it was still very common in Hellenistic and Roman unpretentious prose.³ The two variants probably had equal status in lower styles in the Roman period; occasionally, they even co-exist in the same piece of unsophisticated prose (cf. BGU I 48.7,14). In sharp contrast to this choice, the same man rejected other puristic elements, irrespective of their degree of (re-)integration into the linguistic system. As expected, uncommon dual endings were consistently disregarded (§ 1.2.2.3.2.2 no. A), probably because of a deliberate decision to avoid intense puristic affectation. But the expression χάριν ἐπιστάμεθα (l. 5) presupposes an act of resistance even to mild puristic intervention. The repertoire of Greek offered a set of alternative periphrases by which to express the message 'acknowledge/owe a debt of gratitude' (LSJ s.v. χάρις II 2), thus:

- (a) χάριν οἶδα: good Attic, it survived into Koine, occasionally even in casual epistolary prose, see P.Oxy. VI 963.6 (ii or iii AD). It was recommended by Phryn. *Ecl.* 10 Fischer; [Herod.] *Philet.* 33 Dain;
- (b) χάριν ἔχω: class. (Hdt., Plat., Lys., Hyper.) and post-class. (Charit., Heliod., also in papyri).⁴ It was accepted by Moer. 213.28 Bekker;
- (c) χάριν (προς)οφείλω: class. (Xen., Dem.);

¹ 687 e. εὐκταῖον is v.l. for εὐκτέον.

² The papyrus was penned by the same scribe as no. II A, although they were written on behalf of two different individual. On the language and style of P.Ryl. 624 see Ch. IV § 1.3.4.2.

³ For information on Hellenistic inscriptions, see Schweizer 1898, 151; Hauser 1916, 88; E. Nachmanson, *Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften* (Uppsala 1904) 133. Ptolemaic papyri: Mayser I 2, p. 31.6-9. LXX: Helbing 1907, 40-41. NT: Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 47,3; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. χάρις. Roman and Byzantine papyri: Gignac II 52.

⁴ Novelists: *LRG* IV 312 s.v. χάρις δβ. For a papyrus example see IV E no. (b) 3.

- (d) χάριν ἐπίσταμαι: unclass., found in elevated literature ¹ and occasionally in imperial correspondence (§ 1.3.5 nos. A 4,5);
- (e) χάριν γινώσκω: unclass., it was used by authors of different puristic orientations (Charit., Xen. Eph.,² Philostr.);
- (f) χάριν ὁμολογέω: unclass., found in several novelists (Ach. Tat., Charit., Heliod.) and in unpretentious prose contemporary with this papyrus.³

The writer preferred (d), an elevated but unclassical and therefore non-puristic variant, to such well-integrated puristic variants as (a) and (b), although at least the former was well-known to the Atticists.⁴ This is a clear indication of deliberately non-puristic conduct. It shows that not all elements of refined language were also puristic, and that stylistic ambition could lead to non-puristic choices in written usage.

(B) A mixed profile is also found in P.David 14 (= P.Stras. IV 169 + P.Ross.Georg. II 43), a second-century letter written in a refined style (Ch. IV § 1.3.2). Puristic features include a high profile item such as ἀμφοῖν (cf. § 1.2.2.3.2.2) and two elements characteristic of moderate purism: (i) μέχρι for μέχρις (l. 18) ⁵ (cf. § 1.3.5 no. C 1); (ii) οἶμαι in place of νομίζω (l. 26) (§ 1.3.5 no. B 1). Given the non-parenthetical function of this verb, however, the form οἶσθαι would have been a puristically more acceptable variant (cf. § 1.3.5 no. B 1). The use of the γιν- spelling instead of γινν- (l. 19) is another offence against mild Atticism (cf. (I) above). On balance, the letter seems to exhibit an approximately equal consideration of puristic and non-puristic variants. This points to a moderate profile. But in view of the repeated acts of self-censorship and the reception of a high level item, the impact of purism on performance seems to have been more marked in this case than in (A).

(C) P.Oxy. VII 1070 (= Tibiletti 1979 no. 16), a late third-century letter characterised by occasional attempts to raise the stylistic level of performance,⁶ displays well-integrated variants of both puristic and non-puristic character. The writer adopted moderate profile items such as ττ (ll. 15, 16) and μέχρι (l. 44; cf. § 1.3.5 no. C 1), and also a well-integrated non-puristic variant such as εὐχαριστέω + dat. of pers. 'be grateful to sb.' (l. 47). This verb is a Hellenistic coinage. The meaning used in this

¹ Cf. LSJ s.v. χάρις II 2, Moscadi 1970, 111. Some occurrences are also found in Chariton, see LRG IV 312 s.v. χάρις δβ.

² See LRG IV 312 s.v. χάρις δβ.

³ Novelists: LRG IV 312 s.v. χάρις δβ. Fourth-century papyri: P. Sakaon 44.18 ~ P.Turner 44.18-19 (AD 331-332); P.Neph. 6. 10-11 (IV C no. (a) 2 below).

⁴ See e.g. Luc. Bis Acc. 17.

⁵ Apparently μέχ[ρις] would not suit the spacing.

⁶ Cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 6; Ch. IV § 1.1.1.

papyrus was very common in all Koine periods ¹ and was proscribed by authorities of various puristic orientations (cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 10 Fischer; [Herod.] *Philet.* 33 Dain).

(IV) Purism had a mild impact even on less cultivated correspondence. In P.Haun. II 16, a second-/third-century discreetly-phrased letter, a case of ττ (l. 6) occurs side by side with well-integrated non-puristic variants. Uncommon dual endings were avoided, and τάχιον was preferred to its high-profile puristic equivalent (θαττον) (cf. § 1.2.1.2.3 no. 19). Although avoiding elements characteristic of severe purism, the writer evidently contented himself with censoring purism. This mode of puristic activity occasionally influenced more casual correspondence. Suggestive evidence is supplied by a small group of letters which a certain Paul dispatched to a monk called Nephros in the mid-fourth century AD (P.Neph. 1-9).²

(A) P.Neph. 1.

(a) Non-puristic features include:

1. ἀνάκειμαι 'lie down' (l. 10). This meaning seems a late development of 'lie at table' (Soph., Arist., new comedy),³ which was proscribed by Ammonius (*De adf. voc. diff.* 40, p. 12.9 Nickau), Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 187 Fischer, *Praep. soph.* 46.10 de Borries), and Pseudo-Herodian (*Philet.* 34 Dain). Cf. also *Sud.* α 1898 Adler;
2. ἔγγιστα (l. 16). The form was condemned by Orus A 33 Alpers.⁴

(b) Puristic features include:

1. ττ (l. 31: optative in the farewell formula !);
2. διὰ παντός (l. 30), which was regarded by Phryn. *Ecl.* 74 Fischer as an acceptable alternative to non-puristic πάντοτε.

(B) P.Neph. 4.

(a) Non-puristic features include:

1. γιν- for γιγν- (cf. (I) above);
2. two cases of cc (ll. 19, 34).

(b) A puristic feature: χάριν for χάριτα (l. 23), cf. (III) (A) above;

(c) A feature of uncertain classification: ἀγοράζω 'buy' (l. 20). It was condemned by Aelius Dionysius (α 23 Erbse ⁵), but not by Ammonius (*De adf. voc. diff.* 524, p. 135.13-136.2 Nickau), Phrynichus (*Praep. soph.* 32.17 de Borries) and the

¹ Cf. LSJ s.v. εὐχαριστέω 2; Rutherford 1881, 69-70.

² For information on these letters and a discussion of their style see Appendix (B) § 1.8.

³ 'Lie at table': LSJ s.v. III. 'Lie down': because of sickness (as here), LSJ *Rev. Suppl.* s.v. III; Kramer-Shelton 1987, 38; in other contexts, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. 1; Leont. *Neap. Vita Io. Eleem.* 41, p. 80.15 Gelzer (with a prostitute) etc.

⁴ This form is occasionally found in classical Greek: cf. Antiphon 4.4.11, Dem. 18.165 (in a forged document; cf. Koch 1909, 10-11). Individuals might have considered it puristically acceptable. For bibliography on this form see Alpers 1981, 166. Occurrences in Roman papyri will be found in Gignac II 155.

⁵ This gloss must be interpreted in the light of Antiatt. 78.8 Bekker. Cf. also Moer. 191.11 Bekker; Tzetz. *Comm. in Aristoph. Plut.* 7.15 Massa Positano.

Chapter Three

Antiatticist (78.8 Bekker).

(C) P.Neph. 6.

(a) Non-puristic items include:

1. σήμερον (l. 7), cf. § 1.3.2;
2. χάριν ὁμολογέω (l. 10-11), cf. (III) (A) (f) above;

(b) the puristic form μέχρη (l. 7), cf. § 1.3.5 no. C 1.

(D) P.Neph. 7.

The letter has a non-puristic item, namely *δυσωπείομαι* + acc. of pers. = *αἰσχύνομαι*, *αἰδέομαι* + acc. of pers. (l. 6). This meaning was condemned by Phryn. *Ecl.* 160 Fischer; [Herod.] *Philet.* 183 Dain; Ael. Dion. 8 34 Erbse; Moer. 194.22 Bekker; Anonym. *De impr.* 32 Nickau.¹

(E) P.Neph. 8.

(a) Non-puristic features include:

1. cc (3x, see ll. 6,8,12);
2. γιν- for γιγν- (ll. 11,17,30), cf. (I) above;
3. καθώς (l. 16), proscribed by Phryn. *Ecl.* 399 Fischer; Moer. 200.27 Bekker.

(b) Puristic features include:

1. the Attic form τέως (l. 20), an artificial revival characteristic of late Roman and late antique Greek.² In P.Neph. 5.19, the same form is used adverbially ('in the meantime') without the article and preposition in conformity with the requirements of purists, see § 1.3.1.3 (A);
2. χάριν for χάριτα (l. 3), cf. (III) (A) above;
3. χάριν ἔχω (l. 3), cf. (III) (A) (b) above;
4. γινν- for γιν- (l. 4), cf. (I) above.

Not all the supposedly puristic items included in these lists represent secure indicators of puristic intervention. This is particularly evident in A, where ττ may be an incidental effect of the selection of a fixed formula. The use of τέως in E, however, can be attributed to puristic intervention. Both this item and the the dual endings found in PSI IV 286 and SB VI 9616v (§ 1.2.2.3.2.2) show that censoring purism had an impact even on casual epistolary performance. The extent to which this mode of puristic activity operated in such circumstances varied considerably. Elements such as τέως and the dual represent cases of intense intervention, but casual linguistic behaviour was normally exempt from the influence of such puristic activity. The impact of purism on Paul's performance, for example, is generally limited. All his letters except E are free of high profile items. Moreover, puristic items were adopted inconsistently and

¹ Cf. also Phot. *Amphil.* 21 (PG 101, 152 A); *Lex.* 858-860 Theodor.; *Sud.* 8 1674 Adler; Erbse 1950, 116 *ad loc.* For another papyrus occurrence of *δυσωπείομαι* in this sense see Kramer-Shelton 1987, 55-56.

² See Tabachovitz 1943, 72-73; Zilliacus 1967, 81.

capriciously.¹ Whether the censorship was undertaken unconsciously or deliberately cannot be determined, nor is it possible to tell who carried it out.²

Evidence discussed in this section shows that no type of epistolary performance in antiquity was in principle exempt from the influence of purism. Acts of puristic self-censorship are found not only in refined letters but also in predominantly unsophisticated compositions. The effects of puristic intervention on epistolary communication, however, were variable. Even premeditated language behaviour could entail different responses to the stimulus of linguistic purification as a component of language cultivation. The existence of varying strategies of puristic intervention in refined letters from one and the same century seems a strong argument in favour of this conclusion. Moreover, high profile items could be accepted (I; III B) or rejected (P.Haun. 16 (IV)). The same is true of assimilated puristic features. An educated individual appears to have deliberately avoided two such variants, probably because they were considered unfit for his chosen level of literary refinement (III A). Furthermore, at least one stylistically pretentious letter occurs in which well-integrated puristic variants were consistently disregarded.³ It follows that the extent to which well-integrated non-puristic features were taken into consideration varied considerably.

A variety of factors may have influenced the practice of purism in letter-writing, but they generally escape detection. The whole matter rests on dubious speculation. The functional aspect of puristic activity, for example, can on no occasion be assessed on firm grounds. Ancient theorists recommended taking due account of recipients, particularly of their personality and social position, while writing a letter (Ch. II § 2.2.1 II ii). P.Sarap. 84a.6-9, an early second-century papyrus, offers evidence that there was an awareness among Greek-speaking individuals in Roman Egypt about the rank of the recipient as a determinant of usage in letter-writing. According to the writer, a letter to the prefect (ἐπιστολὴ ἡγεμονικὴ) should be written 'well' (καλῶς): the adverb seems to refer to style and not to handwriting.⁴ Moreover, editors of papyrus letters have often pointed out that both the phraseology and the tone vary according to the hierarchic relationship between the sender and the recipient. Yet I am unable to cite a single letter in which the rank of the recipient can be shown to have influenced the writer's puristic conduct. The set of letters examined in section IV above (nos. A-E) is a

¹ Contrast ττ (A) with cc (E), on the one hand, and χάριν ἔχω (E) with χάριν ὁμολογέω (C) on the other.

² The professional scribes who penned the letters on Paul's behalf might have 'improved' the language in places.

³ P.Mil.Vogl. I 24: cf. Ch. IV § 1.2.1.

⁴ For this interpretation of the passage see J. Schwartz, *P.Sarap.* (1961) p. 228.

good illustration of the difficulties which face the linguist. Considering the content and the tone of the letters, and also the relationship between Paul and Nepheros, we could suppose that the very mild level of puristic intensity apparent in Paul's epistolary performance was meant as a sign of respect for Nepheros. But there is another possible explanation: Paul's puristic conduct might reflect his normal linguistic behaviour. In this case, the personality of the recipient cannot have been an influential consideration in the selection of the puristic profile.

Petitions

1.3.4. Purism had a variable impact on language usage in petitions. Petitions occur in which no consideration was given to puristic variants. Just as in private letters, however, acts of puristic intervention are found not only in refined petitions but also in carelessly-composed items. A few examples can be offered in illustration of this phenomenon.

(A) A selection of cultivated petitions characterised by distinct puristic refinement.

1. P.Vind.Tand. 2, an early third-century draft petition from a former exegetes of Heracleopolis to the prefect of Egypt, exhibits an occurrence of θᾶττον (l. 5). The petitioner composed the text of the petition with much care (§ 1.2.1.2.4).

2. P.Oxy. XLVII 3366 (= P.Coll.Youtie II 66) contains two draft versions of the same petition from Lollianus, public grammarian (δημόσιος γραμματικός) of Oxyrhynchus and scholar (σχολαστικός),¹ to the emperors Valerian and Gallienus (AD 253-260):² cf. ll. 1-16 (text A) and 40-70 (text C). C seems to be a revised version of A. The main text of C may have been written by a scribe to Lollianus' dictation, while both the interlinear alterations in C and possibly the whole of A may be Lollianus' own work.³ The petition is characterised by a composite puristic profile. Puristic items include a well-integrated variant such as ττ (A, l. 1; gap in C) and a remarkable high-profile item such as the optative oblique in a final clause after a secondary tense (A, l. 15; gap in C).⁴ Dual endings, on the other hand, were consistently avoided whenever the petitioner addressed the emperors. This attitude, which offends against severe purism, manifested itself in A

¹ Cf. Parsons 1976, 409-410, 412-413; Kaster 1988, 304-305 no. 90; Cribiore 1996, 168 no. (3).

² For the date of the petition see Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 4.

³ Cf. Parsons 1976, 412.

⁴ This Atticising feature was exceedingly rare in papyri and inscriptions. Cf. Turner, *Syntax* 128-129, Parsons 1976, 427 and Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 386, 4, where further bibliography will be found. On the optative in general see Anlauf 1961.

and was maintained in C (§ 1.2.2.3.2.4).

The petition displays a literary expansion of the emperors' title (l. 1) and a very rhetorical preamble (ll. 6-11).¹ The same petitioner also wrote a letter which shows great concern for language and style (Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 4).

3. P.Oxy. VIII 1119.14-22 (= *W.Chr.* 397), a copy of a petition of AD 244 from the officials and Senate of Antinoopolis to the epistrategus (§ 1.2.2.3.2.4 no. 3), exhibits elements of refined style. The writer arranged words with care and indulged in balanced period constructions: cf. ll. 15-16 μὲν . . . δὲ . . . , ἔπειτα δέ (cf. App. (B) § 1.6 (i) 1), 18 & 21 τε . . . καί (cf. § 1.3.1.3.1). He also adopted two features characteristic of extreme purism: (i) οἶσθα (l. 15) (cf. § 1.3.3 (I)); (ii) δυοῖν (l. 20). The significance of the latter as an indicator of deliberate puristic intervention, however, is unclear (cf. § 1.2.2.3.2.4).

(B) A selection of carelessly-composed petitions characterised by distinct puristic refinement.

1. SB XVIII 13932 (= P.Oxy. XXII 2343), a petition of AD 287 from an eirenarch to the prefect of Egypt, is characterised by unartificial word order and heavy parataxis. In particular, ll. 7-11 consist of two long sequences of καί's used to co-ordinate main clauses with different subjects. The language, however, displays a mixed puristic profile. The use of σήμερον (l. 10), a well-integrated non-puristic variant, offends against extreme purism (§ 1.3.2). On the other hand, 2 cases of ἔφησθα are found (ll. 9, 11). This form was recommended by Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 206 Fischer) and represents a mark of intense puristic pretension. Even strongly Atticising writers such as Lucian and Aelius Aristides used ἔφησθα side by side with ἔφης.²

2. P.Vind.Tand. 4, a petition³ from some βουλευταί of Arsinoe to the strategus (AD 313-315, see *BL* VIII 505), exhibits an occurrence of τήμερον (l. 20), which represents a mark of strong Atticising pretension (§ 1.3.2).

3. P.Oxy. VIII 1117, a draft petition to the prefect of Egypt (c. AD 178), has an occurrence of δυοῖν (l. 16) (cf. § 1.2.2.3.2.4 no. 2).

As we have seen, the most uncommon dual endings seem to have been considered unfit for petitions (cf. §§ 1.2.2.3.2.4, 1.2.3). Yet writers made frequent use of unassimilated

¹ Title: Parsons 1976, 425. Preamble: Parsons 1976, 426 (on A); cf. P. Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity. Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison-London 1992)35.

² Schmid II 33, IV 599; Lobeck 1820, 236; Rutherford 1881, 225-227; Veitch 1887, 674-675. ἔφης is used e.g. in P.Oxy. XLI 2996.30 (Gignac II 413), a linguistically and stylistically unpretentious second-century (?) private letter. On Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser I 2, p. 81.21-22; Mandilaras 1973 § 143. Cf. also Kühner-Blass II 211.

³ R. Hübner, *Gnomon* 51 (1979) 571 suggests a written defence rather than a petition.

items characterised by a lower degree of puristic intensity. This attitude is found in all the six petitions listed above. It was thus unrelated to the planned level of stylistic refinement of performance. Three of the sources also offer opportunities to assess the practice of purism on the basis of more than one item of evidence. High level profiles are found in A2 and A3. In both petitions, consistent use was made of puristic variants. Only high profile elements are found in A3, whereas A2 exhibits features characteristic of different types of puristic orientation. As we have seen, dual forms may have been avoided in the latter because of an aversion for exceedingly affected performance (§ 1.2.2.3.2.4). On the other hand, the exact profile of B1 cannot be determined. As the papyrus is a copy taken from a τόμος συγκολλήσιμος, the reading σήμερον might not be genuine. If τήμερον was the original reading, then the profile of the text should be described as a high level profile very similar to that of A3. Alternatively, if σήμερον is genuine, such a well-integrated non-puristic variant may have slipped through for lack of vigilance. This would point to a moderate puristic profile.

The high rank of recipients may have represented a stimulus to the reception of purism in all these petitions, although it did not exert an equal influence on performance outside the realm of purism.

Imperial Correspondence

1.3.5. Only a small portion of the extant imperial letters can be used to assess the effects of puristic intervention on correspondence issued by the imperial chancery. Many sources are highly fragmentary, and well-preserved items are very short and therefore uninformative on the practice of purism. The relevant evidence documents a wide variety of puristic profiles:

A. Hadrian (AD 117-138)

AD 125 ?

1. Oliver 1989 no. 56, a letter (from Hadrian ?) to the citizens of Heracleia in Macedonia.

¹ The text displays 2 occurrences of the 3rd pers. plur. imp. ending -σαν (ll. 1 λειτουργεῖωσαν, 2 ἔστωσαν), a standard Koine form which offends against extreme purism (see B 6 (b) below).

AD 125

2. Oliver 1989 no. 75, a letter to the Delphians.² Only well-integrated non-puristic elements occur. They include:

- 2 occurrences of the 3rd pers. plur. imp. ending -σαν (col. i 11 ἔστωσαν, ii 24 ἡκέτωσαν), see B 6 (b) below;
- an act of disregard for dual endings belonging to Categories 1,4,10: col. i 14 δύο ψῆφοι εἰσιν.

¹ F. Martín 1982 no. 17.

² F. Martín 1982 no. 18.

Chapter Three

Both of them offend against extreme purism.

AD 126

3. Oliver 1989 no. 78, a letter to the Achaean league.¹ An occurrence of $\tau\tau$ is found at l. 63 (B; A missing).

AD 127

4. Oliver 1989 no. 80, a letter to the magistrates, the βουλή, and the citizens of Stratonicea Hadrianopolis.² χάριν ἐπίσταμαι, a high-level, yet non-puristic, variant (§ 1.3.3 III A), occurs at l. 30.
5. Oliver 1989 no. 81, a letter to the magistrates, the βουλή, and the citizens of Hadrianopolis.³ An occurrence of χάριν ἐπίσταμαι, an unassimilated non-puristic variant (§ 1.3.3 III A), is found at l. 46.

AD 119-128

6. Oliver 1989 no. 89, a letter to the Beroeans.⁴ The use of ναόν instead of νεών (l. 12)⁵ (A; B missing) offends against extreme purism (§ 1.3.1.2).

AD 132

7. Oliver 1989 no. 85, a letter to the Athenians.⁶ An occurrence of ἴστε, a puristic form (B 8 below), is found at l. 10.

Uncertain Date

8. Oliver 1989 no. 91, a letter from Hadrian (?) to the [Spartans].⁷ The text exhibits:
- an offence against extreme purism: cf. the 3rd pers. plur. imp. ending -σαν (col. ii 15 κρι]νέτωσαν) (B 6 (b) below);
 - a well-integrated puristic variant: cf. $\tau\tau$ at col. ii 7.
9. Oliver 1989 no. 77, a letter of Hadrian.⁸ An ex. of the 3rd pers. plur. imp. ending -σαν occurs at l. 9. On this form see B 6 (b) below.
10. F. Martín 1982 no. 40, a letter to the Delphians. The text exhibits two well-integrated puristic variants:
- $\tau\tau$ (col. ii 32);
 - οἴομαι with an acc. + inf. construction (col. ii 33): cf. B 1 below.

B. Antoninus Pius (AD 138-161)

AD 140-144

1. Oliver 1989 no. 135 A, a letter to the Ephesians.⁹ οἶμαι was used instead of νομίζω at l. 10. The former was accepted by Moeris 205.11 Bekker. The vb., however, is associated with an acc. + inf. construction. In such cases, [Herod.] *Philet.* 82 Dain recommended using οἴομαι rather than οἶμαι. Is the reading genuine? Unfortunately, the verb is not preserved in the other surviving copies of the letter.

¹ IG II² 1094 = F. Martín 1982 no. 21.

² IGRR IV 1156 = F. Martín 1982 no. 23.

³ IGRR IV 1156 = F. Martín 1982 no. 24.

⁴ F. Martín 1982 no. 9.

⁵ So Martin. Oliver prints μόνον. The photograph published in *JRS* 30 (1940) 149 is of no help.

⁶ IG II² 1102 = F. Martín 1982 no. 45.

⁷ F. Martín 1982 no. 13.

⁸ IG II² 1103 = F. Martín 1982 no. 14.

⁹ SIG³ II 849 = IK 15.1489.

AD 145

2. Oliver 1989 no. 138, a letter to the Ephesians.¹ καὶ γὰρ occurs at l. 13. Ancient grammarians were divided as to the recognition of the crasis as puristic (cf. § 1.3.2 (C)).

AD 151

3. Oliver 1989 no. 149, a letter to the Corydallians.² Features labelled as either puristic or non-puristic by Atticist lexicographers are unattested. Note, however, the unaugmented plupf. at l. 8. Though found occasionally in higher level Greek, this was a characteristic of unpretentious Koine (cf. Ch. IV § 1.2.2).

AD 152

4. Oliver 1989 no. 165, a letter to the citizens of Antinoopolis.³ Non-puristic features include:
— cc for ττ (l. 39);
— subj. in place of an opt. oblique in a secondary clause after a past tense (39 συνεχώρησε . . . ὅπως . . . ἦτε).

AD 154/155

5. Oliver 1989 no. 113, a letter to Coronea. The use of the opt. oblique in a final clause after a secondary tense (ll. 5-6 πεμφομένη[αι] | ὑμεῖν ἐκέλευσα ὡς εἰδείητε) is an element of extreme purism (§ 1.3.4 A2).

AD 158

6. Oliver 1989 no. 156, a letter to a city of Upper Macedonia.⁴ The text is characterised by a mixed profile.

(a) Puristic features include:

- ττ for cc (l. 4);
— an opt. in a secondary clause after a primary tense (a hyperpuristic feature which was very common in the Atticists but rare in lower styles⁵): ll. 6-8 συνεχωρῶ (l. συγχ-) . . . ὡς . . . σχοίητε;
— διδόασιν (l. 7), probably a feature of extreme purism, cf. Antiatt. 88.24 Bekker.⁶

- (b) The 3rd pers. plur. imp. ending -σαν, an offence against extreme purism, was retained at ll. 9 (ἔστωσαν) and 12-13 (ὑπακουέτωσαν). This was proscribed by Moeris (188.2 Bekker), by the compiler of the *Λέξεις ῥητορικαί* (Bekker, *Anecd. Gr.* I 212.22), and by other authorities (Schmid II 26 n. 48), who rather regarded the ending -ντων as puristic. But in second-century AD written usage, -ντων was mostly confined to strongly Atticising literature, where it was used as a mark of severe puristic pretension.⁷ The ending -σαν was normally retained in prose works characterised by moderate purism (Aelian [Schmid III 32] is an exception).

¹ SIG³ II 850 = IK 15.1491.

² TAM II 3 no. 905 XII C 8-XII D 7 (doc. 47), pp. 338-339.

³ P.Würzb. 9.34-41.

⁴ IGBulg IV 2263.

⁵ Atticists: Schmid I 97-98, 243, II 58, III 82, IV 90; Turner, *Syntax* 129. For occurrences outside the Atticists see Radermacher 1925, 163-164 (with examples from papyri).

⁶ The Antiatticist cites classical evidence in support of διδοῦσιν. It follows (i) that there were severe purists who recommended διδόασιν; (ii) that mild purists such as the compiler of the Antiatticist regarded διδοῦσιν as equally puristic.

⁷ Cf. Crönert 1903, 219 n. 2; Schmid I 229-230, II 26, IV 27. For exceptional occurrences in documents see Schmid II 27; Mandilaras 1973 § 687(3) (citing P.Lond. II 359.1,5, p. 150, official regulations perhaps of AD 146-147 [BL VII 85]).

Chapter Three

7. Oliver 1989 no. 157, a letter from Pius and Marcus Aurelius to a Dionysiac Society at Smyrna.¹ The text is characterised by a moderately puristic profile. Note ττ for cc (l. 10 ἡττον) and an irreal apodosis without ἄν (l. 11).

Uncertain Date

8. Oliver 1989 no. 123, extracts from a letter to the Bereniceans.² ἵστε (l. 71) is a puristic feature, see Phryn. *Praep. soph.* 92.7 de Borries (cf. also Moer. 200.6 Bekker). Recitative ὅτι is restored at l. 74.
9. Oliver 1989 no. 160 A/B, a letter (from Antoninus Pius ?) to the Ephesians.³

(a) Puristic features include:

- 2 exx. of θαττον (ll. 12, 13) (cf. § 1.2.1 [on these occurrences see § 1.2.1.2.1]);
- an opt. oblique in a secondary clause after a past tense: ἐνετειλάμην . . . ὅπως . . . λαμβάνοι (ll. 10-11; λαμβά[νο]ι B) (cf. § 1.3.4 A2);
- ττ for cc (l. 2; gap in B).

- (b) Only a non-puristic element occurs, viz. the standard post-class. form ἑαυτοῖς = σφῖσιν αὐτοῖς (l. 7. Gap in B). This form occurs even in Philostratus (Schmid IV 70). The Attic form is occasionally found in literature (Crönert 1903, 197 n. 2). It also appears in later imperial constitutions (Gignac II 170).

C. Marcus Aurelius & Lucius Verus (AD 161-169 *in.*)

AD 161 or 162

1. Oliver 1989 no. 166, a letter to the citizens of Antinoopolis.⁴ Puristic features include:

- ττ for cc (l. 51);
- μέχρι for -χρις (l. 51-52: the first two letters are restored), cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 6 Fischer; [Herod.] *Philet.* 69 Dain.

AD 162 or 163 or 164

2. Oliver 1989 no. 170, a letter to Ulpus Eurycles at Ephesus.⁵

(a) Puristic features include:

- ττ for cc (l. 14 ἡτ[τον]);
- ἔδοσαν (l. 31) (cf. Moeris 187.20 Bekker);

- (b) A well-integrated non-puristic feature is found at l. 32 (cc for ττ).

D. Marcus Aurelius alone (AD 169-177)

AD 174/175

1. Oliver 1989 no. 184, a letter to the Athenians.

(a) Puristic features include:

- elements characteristic of extreme purism:
 - τήμερον ('plaque' II 77), cf. § 1.3.2;
 - τετυχηκ- (Attic) for τετευχ- (Arist., Koine) ('plaque' I fr. D 3), cf. Phryn. *Ecl.* 374 Fischer.⁶

¹ SIG³ II 851 = IGRR IV 1399 = IK 24 (1). 600.

² J. Reynolds, *JRS* 68 (1978) 114 (ll. 69-77) with commentary on pp. 119-120.

³ IK 11 (1). 15-16.

⁴ P.Würzb. 9.42-52.

⁵ OGIS II 508 (ll. 1-13 only) = IK 11 (1). 25. Date: Oliver assigns the inscription to 163 or 164; the editors of OGIS and IK print 162/163.

⁶ The latter is attested more frequently in Koine, particularly outside the circle of strict Atticists, see Mayser I 2, p. 151-152; Mandilaras 1973 § 435(8); Gignac II 298 (revised by

Chapter Three

a dual form belonging to Category 1 ('plaque' II 66 ἀμφοῖν) (cf. § 1.2.2.3.2.5);

— features found in moderately puristic profiles:

4 exx. of ττ for cc ('plaque' II 15,39,74,75);

2 exx. of μέχρι ('plaque' I fr. C 14, 'plaque' II 63), cf. C 1 above.

(b) Non-puristic features comprise several offences against extreme purism.

These include:

— 2 secure cases of disregard for dual forms of numerals ('plaque' II 37,39 δύο [gen.]; δύο [gen.] is also restored at l. 10-11) (cf. § 1.2.5);

— 3rd pers. plur. imp. ending -σαν (l. 74 ἀπαλλαττέσθωσαν), cf. B 6 above;

— consistent disregard for dual forms belonging to Categories 4,5,8 (cf. § 1.2.5): 'plaque' II 66 ἐξ ἀμφοῖν τῶν γονέων . . . εὖ γεγονότων (C 1 + -C 4 + -C 8); 81 ἐξ ἑκατέρου τῶν μερῶν (-C 5).¹

E. Marcus Aurelius & Commodus (AD 177-180)

AD 177

1. Oliver 1989 no. 190, a letter to the [Phereans].² τετυχηκ- (l. 6) is a puristic feature, cf. D 1(a) above.

2. Oliver 1989 no. 192, a letter to the Milesians.³ The opt. oblique was used twice: cf. ll. 12-14 προσήκειν ἡγησάμεθα διαλεχθῆναι . . . ὅπως ἰσχυρωρήσειεν; 19-20 ὅπως εἰδείητε ὑποτέτακται (note the perf. !).⁴

AD 179

3. Oliver 1989 no. 196, a letter to the Athenian Gerusia. There are occurrences of ττ for cc (l. 59 τέτταρας) and of ἐωνήμεθα (l. 56). The latter is a feature of uncertain classification, see § 1.3.1.1 no. (C).

F. Commodus (AD 180-192)

AD 189

1. Oliver 1989 no. 211, a letter to the Aphrodisians.⁵ ἐπιδημεῖν (l. 6) was considered puristic by some authorities, cf. Antiatt. 93.27-28 Bekker. For a non-puristic variant see cc for ττ (l. 9-10).

G. Septimius Severus (AD 193-211)

AD 197

1. Oliver 1989 no. 215, a letter from Severus and Caracalla to the Delphians. μέχρι, a puristic feature (C 1 above), is found at l. 23.

AD 198

2. Oliver 1989 no. 205, a letter to the Delphians. ἴστε, a puristic element (B 8 above), is found at l. 12.

J. Rea, in *P.Oxy.* LI [1984] 29-30). It also occurs in Dio Chrysostom (Schmid I 86), but not in Philostratus (Schmid IV 40). MSS of post-classical authors often fluctuate between the two forms: cf. Crönert 1903, 280; Inglese 1996, 156; τετευχ- is also v.l. in Dem. 21.150.

¹ Cases of plural forms of nouns following *plural* forms of numerals ('plaque' II 37, 39, and possibly also 10-11) are not significant.

² IG V (1) 1319.

³ P. Hermann, *MDAI(I)* 25 (1975) 149-166.

⁴ Cf. § 1.3.4 A2. For a case of opt. in a secondary clause after the perfect see Schmid IV 90 (Philostratus).

⁵ Reinolds 1982, 118-124 no. 16.

3. Oliver 1989 no. 217, a letter from Severus and Caracalla to the Nicopolitans ad Istrum.¹ ττ occurs at l. 29.
4. Oliver 1989 no. 219, a letter from Severus (and Caracalla) to the Aphrodisians.² Puristic features include ττ (l. 29) and possibly a case of optative oblique (l. 11).

AD 202

5. Oliver 1989 no. 255, a letter (from Severus and Caracalla) to the citizens of Smyrna.³ χάριν (l. 11) is a puristic variant, see § 1.3.3 III A above.

Greek imperial letters were issued by the department of *ab epistulis* (Ch. I § 2.2.1), but many details of procedure are unknown.⁴ At least by the second century, the office-holder undoubtedly played an active role in the composition of the letters,⁵ but it is unclear whether he was required to compose every letter. One wonders, for instance, whether the bureau comprised one or more assistants, and if so, whether they also played a part in preparing the imperial letters. In particular, were Greek scribes entrusted with the task of composing letters in Greek when the *ab epistulis* was held by a Latin-speaking man? Did Greek scribes help Greek secretaries with the composition of Greek correspondence? Moreover, did emperors who were well-versed in Greek prose, such as Marcus Aurelius, write official letters in Greek from time to time?⁶ As Fergus Millar has observed, the procedure 'was no doubt variable from reign to reign and even from moment to moment'.⁷ As we shall see, these uncertainties preclude the assessment of many linguistic phenomena.

Several *literati* are known to have been in charge of the office of *ab epistulis* or *ab epistulis Graecis*.⁸ One of these was Sulpicius Cornelianus, who became *ab epistulis Graecis* sometime during the 160s or the late 170s.⁹ According to

¹ IGBulg II 659.

² Reynolds 1982, 124-127 no. 17.

³ SIG³ II 876 = IGRR IV 1402.

⁴ For a discussion of this topic see Millar 1992, 224-228.

⁵ Millar 1992, 207, 224-228.

⁶ Note that Marcus Aurelius was included by Philostratus in a list of model epistolographers. For a discussion of this piece of information see Ch. II § 2.1.3.

⁷ Millar 1992, 227.

⁸ A list of names is given by Pflaum 1960, II 684 n. 1; they can also be extracted from the lists of *ab epistulis* compiled by Lewis 1981, 150-152 (= 1995, 258-260) and Birley 1992, 48-50. On the phenomenon cf. Bowersock 1969, 50-58; Millar 1992, 91-93; Lewis 1981, 149-154 (= 1995, 257-262); Bowie 1982, 39-54, 57-59.

⁹ *Ecl.* 231, 357, 394 Fischer. The βασιλεῖς mentioned by Phrynichus in 357 and 394 may be either (i) Marcus Aurelius and Verus (AD 161-169) or (ii) Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (AD 177-180). Both possibilities are mentioned by Pflaum 1961, III 1021 and Bowie 1982, 58. Scholars preferring (i): G.B. Townend, *Historia* 10 (1961) 380-381 (who

Phrynichus (*Ecl.* 357 Fischer), his appointment was meant as a reward for his distinguished oratorical performances at court,¹ by which Cornelianus promoted the use of puristic Greek in imperial hearings (ἐξελληνίζων καὶ ἐξαττικίζων τὸ βασιλικὸν δικαστήριον).² Phrynichus dedicated his *Ecloga of Attic Verbs and Nouns* to him. The books, into which the surviving version of the lexicon is divided, seem to have been published separately. Book 2 has long been recognised as a response to Pseudo-Herodian's *Philetaerus*, and Cornelianus has recently been credited with the authorship of this lexicon.³ Judging from Phrynichus' words, book 2 of his *Ecloga* was written after Cornelianus' appointment as *ab epistulis*, perhaps while he was still in charge of the office.⁴ These facts raise the question of whether Cornelianus also practised puristic censorship when writing Greek letters on behalf of the emperors. In the present state of knowledge, it is impossible to offer a firm answer. We do not know to which emperors Cornelianus was *ab epistulis*, let alone the precise date or dates of his secretaryship. This does not allow us to tell whether one or more letters included in lists C and E above were written during his tenure of office. Acts of puristic intervention are found in letters issued by Marcus Aurelius and Commodus in their first regnal year (E 1, E 2) and two years later (E 3). If Cornelianus was *ab epistulis* to them, then either E 1 and E 2 alone, or E 3 alone, or indeed all of them may have been written during his secretaryship. In this case, the censorship may reflect his favourable attitude to purism. Moreover, if Cornelianus was the author of *Philetaerus* and held the post of *ab epistulis* in AD 179, then the form ἐωνήμεθα in E 3 would be very likely to have been deliberately chosen as a good puristic feature. There is no telling, however, whether Cornelianus was *ab epistulis* in the years 177 and/or 179.⁵ Even if, as has been

suggests c. AD 168); Lewis 1981, 151 (no. 18), 161 n. 18 (= 1995, 259 [no. 18], 269 n. 18); Swain 1996, 53 n. 43 (who suggests the early 160s). Scholars favouring (ii): Bowersock 1969, 54-55; Pflaum 1982, 110; Birley 1992, 46, 50. On Cornelianus cf. also *PIR*¹ III (1898) 283 no. 716; W. Schmid, *RE* IV 1 (1900) 1248. 36-53.

- ¹ Note the use of τοιγαροῦν. This particle usually bears a strong logical force, and means 'therefore', 'in consequence', 'that is why' (*GP*² 566-568). A very similar statement is found in *Ecl.* 394 (ἐν παιδείᾳ μέγιστον ἀξίωμα ἅπαντων ἔχοντα σὲ [Cornelianus] καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ προκρίτων ἀποφανθέντα ὑπὸ βασιλέων ἐπιστολέα αὐτῶν). Cf. Millar 1992, 227 n. 101.
- ² Bowie 1982, 40 comments: 'it is reasonable to suspect that his strength lay in choice of words rather than in declamation'. Indeed, this is more than a suspicion. The verb ἐξαττικίζω points specifically to language purism, cf. Phrynichus' own definition of ἐξαττικίζω: ἀττικίζειν καὶ ἐξαττικίζειν: . . . σημαίνει μέντοι καὶ τὸ Ἀττικῶς λέγειν (*Praep. soph.* 19.3-5 de Borries).
- ³ Cf. Argyle 1989.
- ⁴ *Ecl.* 357 Fischer σε . . . οἱ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖς ἀνέθρεσαν τὰ Ἑλλήνων ἅπαντα πράγματα διοικεῖν . . . ἐπιστολέα ἀποφήναντες.
- ⁵ Bowersock 1969, 55 writes: 'there is not yet any reason to assume it [Cornelianus' tenure]

suggested, he had been appointed to the post late in the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, the issue would remain open, because we are presently uninformed about the practice of purism of the imperial chancery during those years. Greater problems arise if Cornelianus' secretaryship is placed early in the reign of Marcus and Verus. Letters written in this period display evidence of puristic activity: cf. C 1 and C 2.¹ As Sex. Caecilius Crescens Volusianus was *ab epistulis* to Marcus and Verus in c. AD 161,² C 1 may well have been written while Volusianus was holding his secretarian post. But what about C 2? Pflaum argued that T. Varius Clemens was appointed *ab epistulis* in c. AD 163.³ If this date is correct, Text C 2 might be dated to the secretaryship of either Volusianus or Clemens.

In fact, imperial letters issued in the last forty years of the second century do not significantly differ from letters written in earlier decades in terms of puristic refinement. Even assuming Cornelianus to have put his puristic ideology into practice when composing imperial letters, we must admit that other secretaries or assistants before him made genuine attempts to follow through on the precepts of purists. I have already referred to the likelihood that puristic censorship was undertaken during Volusianus' tenure of the post of *ab epistulis*. Moreover, purism appears to have had an impact on imperial correspondence under the principates of Hadrian (esp. A 7, A 10) and particularly Antoninus Pius, even before Volusianus' secretaryship (cf. esp. B 5, B 6, B 9).

In general, it is hard to tell whether the level of stylistic and puristic refinement of imperial correspondence varied according to the personality of secretaries. Letters dispatched in the years 140-161 offer instructive evidence on this matter. Volusianus, the last individual to serve as an *ab epistulis* under Pius, was not a native Greek. It follows that Text C 1, if it was written during his tenure of office (though early in the reign of Marcus and Verus), might have been composed by a Greek-speaking assistant. There is no good reason to assume that an educated Greek employee was either required or expected to reflect the attitude of his non-Greek superior to puristic Greek in his own usage. The puristic profile of C 1 might thus be

did not [last into the reign of Commodus]'. True, but there is no reason to assume it did, nor can we tell with certainty that it commenced under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus.

¹ Indeed, cc in C 2 might be a simple error made by the stone-cutter.

² Cf. Pflaum 1960, I 337-339 no. 142; Pflaum 1961, III 1020-1021; Lewis 1981, 151 no. 14 (= 1995, 259 no. 14); Birley 1992, 48 no. A 7. As Pflaum has pointed out, *ILS* I 1451 shows that his tenure of office began under Antoninus Pius and lasted into the reign of Marcus and Verus.

³ Pflaum 1960, I 372 (no. 156); cf. Pflaum 1961, III 1021. He is followed by Lewis 1981, 151 no. 15 (= 1995, 259 no. 15), whereas Birley 1992, 48 no. A 8 is more prudent.

unrelated to the personality of Volusianus. But what about his predecessors? A highly rhetorical sentence construction is found in Oliver 1989 no. 115 (= IG VII 2870.4-9),¹ a brief letter which Antoninus Pius sent to the Coroneans in AD 140. The text must have been the work of a professional rhetor. One such candidate might be Caninius Celer, if Bowersock and Birley are correct in suggesting that he was *ab epistulis* not only to Hadrian during the later years of his principate, but also to Pius at the beginning of his reign.² If this hypothesis is right, a direct connection could be established between the learned leadership of the office of *ab epistulis* and the choice of a rhetorical style in actual usage.³ It is regrettable that the letter does not display any specific profile, whether puristic or non-puristic. Unfortunately, however, the suggested date for Celer's secretaryship is not based on firm evidence, and other scholars have assigned it to the reign of Hadrian.⁴

Letters dispatched by Pius in the following years differ considerably in their degree of stylistic and linguistic refinement. Some fourteen years later, another letter to Coronea (Oliver 1989 no. 113 = Text B 5 above) exhibits a fluent style and a rhetorically-composed clause characterised by chiasmus and antitheton (ll. 6-7):

ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑμεῖς μὲν ἐκείνους,
ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ὑμᾶς αἰτιῶνται

By contrast, straightforward, unartificial word order is found in letters written between AD 140 and 155: cf. Oliver 1989 nos. 135 A (B 1; AD 140-144) and 138 (B 2; AD 145). Fluent, yet unrhetorical, imperial letters are attested even for AD 154/155: cf. Oliver 1989 no. 124 (AD 154)⁵ and especially Oliver 1989 no. 116,⁶ another letter to the Coroneans of AD 155. Sex. Cornelius Repentinus is known to have served as an *ab epistulis* sometime in the course of Pius' principate.⁷ One wonders whether he was in office when one or other of those letters was written, and whether he was personally responsible for their composition. In fact, the existence of different types of sentence

¹ Cf. Ch. IV § 2.3.

² Bowersock 1969, 53; Birley 1992, 48 no. A 5.

³ On Celer see W. Schmid, *RE* III 2 (1899) 1870.1-14; Bowersock 1969, 53; Bowie 1982, 40, 43, 58; Birley 1992, 48.

⁴ Cf. Pflaum 1961, III 1021; Lewis 1981, 151 no. 11 (= 1995, 259 no. 11) (on what grounds, however, he dates it to AD 137 I cannot tell); Bowie 1982, 58 ('probably to Hadrian'). In fact, I fail to understand why Ael. Arist. 50.57 K. should be taken as evidence that Celer 'was holding his secretarian post early under Pius' (Bowersock).

⁵ J. Reynolds, *JRS* 68 (1978) 114 (ll. 78-85) with commentary on pp. 120-121. Cf. also J.H. Oliver, *GRBS* 19 (1979) 157-159.

⁶ IG VII 2870.10-18.

⁷ Birley 1992, 48 no. A 6.

construction in letters dating from one and the same year raises the crucial question of whether they represent the work of several individuals employed in the bureau of *ab epistulis*, or different performances of the same individual. Text B 5 exhibits a feature of extreme purism. This suggests a correlation between puristic intervention and the selection of an artificial period construction. Unfortunately, this favourable attitude to stylistic and linguistic refinement cannot be correlated with a precise individual. Unclear information is also provided by letters written in previous years. A non-puristic profile is found in AD 152 (B 4), while linguistic refinement seems to have been disregarded in a letter dispatched in 151 (B 3). Are these performances mere exceptions to an otherwise predominant tendency to accept purism, or do they reflect an unfavourable attitude to language cultivation in the bureau of *ab epistulis* in the early 150s? Texts written during the 140s raise even greater issues. As we have seen, the style of B 1 and B 2 is not an artificial one. The puristic profile of the latter is hard to determine. B 1, on the other hand, seems to display a case of censoring purism. Perhaps, though avoiding artificial period construction, the writer unconsciously practised puristic self-censorship. Who then was he? A scribe or perhaps the secretary himself? This issue is of great importance given the possibility that a rhetor was *ab epistulis* a few years earlier, or possibly even in the same year as B 1. Another problem is how to account for the stylistic discrepancy between B 1 and the letter to the Coroneans of AD 140 (Oliver 1989 no. 115). Do they represent different performances of the same individual or of two different people (that is, two secretaries, or the secretary and a subordinate, or two scribes)? Such uncertainties do not allow us to determine the significance of the particular kind of puristic intervention apparent in B 1. Similarly, no context can be provided for the puristic refinement which characterise B 6 in AD 158, let alone for that of a text of uncertain date such as B 9. The identity of the individuals who composed these letters is unknown.

To summarise, letters issued during the reign of Pius differ in their level of puristic intensity. One of them displays a non-puristic profile (B 4); another exhibits a possible instance of unconscious self-censorship (B 1); several letters are characterised by acts of intense puristic intervention (esp. B 5, 6, 9¹). Three major obstacles preclude the assessment of these divergences. (i) Their statistical significance is uncertain: given the absence of sufficient written evidence on each year, the means do not exist to test the significance of each profile by comparing it with the normal practice of the same bureau in the same year. (ii) A great deal of essential information on the composition of

¹ A further case would be ἄττα in *Dig.* 49.1.1 (from Ulpian, *liber primus de appellationibus*), but the reading is a modern conjecture: the MSS have ἀ δία, which makes no sense.

Chapter Three

imperial correspondence is unavailable. It is thus impossible to distinguish the role played by office-holders from that of subordinates (if any). (iii) Both the precise dates of *ab epistulis* and the identity of the individuals who composed the surviving letters are unknown.

Before Celer, other *literati* were appointed to the post of *ab epistulis* or *ab epistulis Graecis* under Hadrian: (a) L. Julius Vestinus (uncertain date; c. 135 ?),¹ a scholar who is known from the *Suda* to have compiled an epitome of Pamphilus' *Glosses*, a selection of words from Demosthenes, and a selection of words from Thucydides, Isaeus, Isocrates, Thrasyarchus, and other orators² — in other words, he is the sort of man who is in principle expected to have adopted an archaizing language in written usage; (b) C. Avidius Heliodorus (before AD 137),³ a rhetor;⁴ (c) C. Valerius Eudaemon (before AD 142),⁵ another literary man, whose precise sphere of competence

¹ This date was suggested by Pflaum 1960, I 246-247 (no. 105). Lewis 1981, 151 no. 10 (= 1995, 259 no. 10) followed him. Bowie 1982, 57 and Birley 1992, 48 no. A 3 left the date open.

² *Sud.* o 835 Adler. Cf. H. Gärtner, *Der Kleine Pauly* V (1979) 1230.45-51; Millar 1992, 88; Bowie 1982, 40, 43.

³ In 137, he became prefect of Egypt, see § 1.3.6. The suggested dates for his tenure of the post of *ab epistulis* are: (a) 120-122, see O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian* (1905) 257,4; (b) c. 127, see Lewis 1981, 151 no. 8 (= 1995, 259 no. 8); (c) c. 130, see Pflaum 1961, III 1021 no. 106. None of them is based on firm evidence. Other scholars (Pflaum 1960, I 252 [no. 106]; Bowie 1982, 58; Birley 1992, 48 no. A 4) left the date open.

⁴ Cf. Bowersock 1969, 50-51; Millar 1992, 88; Bowie 1982, 41, 43. On Heliodorus see also Swain 1996, 269 with n. 59 (with further bibliography), 298 n. 3.

⁵ In 142, he became prefect of Egypt, see § 1.3.6. The suggested dates for his tenure of the bureau of *ab epistulis* are: (a) c. 125, see Pflaum 1961, III 1021; (b) c. 130, see Lewis 1981, 151 no. 9 (= 1995, 259 no. 9). Neither is based on firm evidence. Other scholars (Pflaum 1960, I 268 [no. 110]; Bowie 1982, 58; Birley 1992, 50 no. C 4) left the date open.

is however unknown.¹ Significant evidence of puristic conduct in letters issued by Hadrian is found only in nos. A 7 and A 10. There is no telling, however, whether one or other of these was personally composed by Vestinus, or Heliodorus, or Eudaemon. Nor are we able to determine at least whether one or other of the numerous non-puristic letters (esp. A 1,2,4,5,6,9) was composed during their tenure of office.

Let us now return to the later decades of the second century. Text D 1 of AD 174/175 might have been issued by the bureau of *ab epistulis Graecis* during the secretaryship of T. Claudius Vibianus Tertullus, since this seems to have occurred sometime between AD 172 and 175.² The matter could be settled, if we accept the suggestion of a scholar of repute that Tertullus was succeeded by Cornelianus under Marcus and Commodus.³ Another candidate might be T. Aius (or Taius) Sanctus, if Lewis is correct in assigning his service as an imperial secretary to c. AD 175.⁴ But there is no firm evidence in favour of this year; Pflaum also argued for a date before AD 171-172.⁵ Both individuals would provide a learned background for the choice of a puristic language in the imperial chancery. Tertullus, an eastern Greek (probably a native Pergamene),⁶ has been credited with 'some kind of rhetorical or literary proficiency'.⁷ Sanctus probably taught rhetoric to Commodus.⁸ Unfortunately, we cannot prove that D 1 was personally composed by the office-holder, nor alternatively that the puristic profile of the letter was the outcome of specific directions given by Tertullus or Sanctus to their subordinate(s).

Philostratus advised imperial secretaries to employ a moderate degree of puristic intensity (Ch. II § 2.1.3). He also assessed the style and language of imperial letters composed by the sophists Aelius Antipater of Hierapolis and Aspasia of Ravenna during their secretaryship (Ch. II § 2.1.3). He offered no comments, however,

¹ Cf. Bowersock 1969, 51; Bowie 1982, 41,43.

² Cf. Pflaum 1961, III 992, followed by all the subsequent scholars, including Bowersock 1969, 54; Millar 1992, 105; Lewis 1981, 151 no. 21 (= 1995, 259 no. 21); Bowie 1982, 59; Birley 1992, 50 no. C 9. On Tertullus see also the bibliography cited in *IK* 13 (1980) p. 46.

³ Bowersock 1969, 55.

⁴ Lewis 1981, 151 no. 22 (= 1995, 259 no. 22). On his *nomen* see L. Moretti, *RFIC* n.s., 38 (88) (1960) 70-72; J. Rea, *P.Oxy.* XXXVI (1970) p. 41.

⁵ Pflaum 1961, III 1005 (no. 178 bis); so also Birley 1992, 50 no. C 8. Cf. Bowie 1982, 59.

⁶ So already Pflaum 1961, III 992.

⁷ Bowersock 1969, 54. However, as Bowie observes, 'the present evidence does not document literary activities' (Bowie 1982, 41; cf. 47).

⁸ Cf. O.W. Reinmuth, *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Leipzig 1935) 128, 136; Millar 1992, 105; Lewis 1981, 161 n. 21 (= 1995, 269 n. 21); Bowie 1982, 40-41,47, 59.

on their attitude to purism. Antipater owed his appointment to the post to Septimius Severus (AD 193-211), who also nominated him tutor to his sons Geta and Caracalla. He was certainly holding his secretarian post between AD 200 and 205.¹ Acts of puristic intervention are consistently found in imperial correspondence issued under the reign of Septimius Severus, though before AD 200: cf. especially G 2-4, which were all written in the year 198. G 5, however, is likely to have been dispatched during Antipater's secretaryship. Yet it is hard to tell whether he personally composed the text. It may be noted that the style of a letter of 201 from [Severus] and Caracalla to the Panhellenion is informal in terms of sentence construction and word order.² According to Philostratus' judgement, Antipater made use of asyndetic sequences in his letters, but the kind of unpretentious style apparent in that letter rather points to a careless composition.

The present evidence does not permit us to reach conclusions about Aspasius' practice of purism. The date of his secretaryship is unknown. He is mentioned as an imperial secretary in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*, which was probably written after 222 and before 238.³ Aspasius' tenure of office may either have preceded or have been contemporary with these dates.⁴

Prefectural Decrees and Letters

1.3.6. A variety of attitudes to purism are also found in decrees and letters issued by the prefects of Egypt. I referred earlier to a case of a decree containing an offence to extreme purism (§ 1.2.1.2.2). This edict may have been issued by M. Petronius Mamertinus. During his tenure of office, he dispatched at least another text in which a

¹ Cf. IK 16. 2026. 17-18 (= Oliver 1989 no. 244), a letter from Caracalla to the Ephesians datable to a year between 200 and 205, cf. Pflaum 1960, II 611-612 (no. 230); Pflaum 1961, III 1021; Birley 1992, 50 no. C 14. Some scholars suggested more precise dates: (a) Lewis 1981, 152 no. 29 (= 1995, 260 no. 29) stated c. 200; (b) Oliver 1989, 471-472 argued for 201; (c) the editors of IK 16 suggested c. 203. Bowie 1982, 59 left the date open. On Antipater see Bowersock 1969, 55-56; Millar 1992, 92-93, 227; Bowie 1982, 40, 46-47; Swain 1996, 370; E. Bowie, *Der Neue Pauly* I (1996) 780-781, and the bibliography listed in IK 16 (1980) p. 19.

² Oliver 1989 no. 245.

³ *Terminus post quem*: *Vit. soph.* 2.31.2, II 123.16 Kayser, cf. T.D. Barnes, *Latomus* 27 (1968) 588, Bowersock 1969, 7 n. 2. Discussions of the date of the *Lives of the Sophists* include F. Solmsen, *RE* XX 1 (1941) 169.61-170.9; Barnes 581-597 (esp. 586 ff.); Bowersock 1969, 6-8. Further bibliography will be found in those works.

⁴ Pflaum 1961, III 1021 and Birley 1992, 50 no. C 16 assigned it to a date between 209 and 229, whereas Lewis 1981, 152 no. 35 (= 1995, 260 no. 35) thought of c. 220 (on what grounds, I cannot tell); cf. also Bowie 1982, 59. On Aspasius see Bowersock 1969, 56; Millar 1992, 93; Bowie 1982, 40; E. Bowie, *Der Neue Pauly* II (1997) 105.

well-integrated non-puristic element was preferred to a high profile variant. The text in question is P.Würzb. 9.53-59,¹ a letter to the strategus of the Thinite nome in which the writer used a subjunctive in place of an optative oblique (ll. 56-58). Yet a letter of AD 135, BGU I 19 col. ii 12-19 (= *M.Chr.* 85), has μέχρι (l. 14), a well-integrated puristic feature (§ 1.3.5 no. C 1) found even in moderately Atticising prose. The writers seem to have been inclined to accept light puristic colouring, whether deliberately or unconsciously, and to avoid features of extreme purism.

Among Mamertinus' second-century successors are four men who served as *ab epistulis* before being promoted to the prefecture of Egypt: (i) C. Avidius Heliodorus, who held the post in AD 137-142 (he was successor to Mamertinus);² (ii) C. Valerius Eudaemon, who was prefect in AD 142-143;³ (iii) C. Calvisius Statianus, who was in office AD 170-175;⁴ (iv) T. (T)aius Sanctus, who held the post in 179/180.⁵ As we have seen, their precise role in the composition of extant imperial correspondence is uncertain (§ 1.3.5). Heliodorus, Eudaemon, and Sanctus, however, were Greek literati, and Cassius Dio (71.22.2) tells us that Heliodorus became prefect of Egypt 'in virtue of his rhetorical skill' (ἐξ ἐμπειρίας ῥητορικῆς). One thus wonders whether they promoted purism during their tenure of the prefecture. It is hard to tell in the light of the present evidence. No edict or letter issued in the name of Sanctus has yet been published.⁶ The only extensive and well-preserved edict of Heliodorus, P.Oxy. XLI 2954.12-25, provides doubtful evidence. Signs of stylistic cultivation⁷ are associated with a feature characteristic of standard non-literary Koine.⁸ This is clearly something unexpected in prose texts whose purpose was to achieve puristic respectability. The more so, considering the rhetorical background of Heliodorus and the reported reason for his appointment to the prefecture. But three arguments may undermine the significance of that feature:

(a) it may be a scribal error (the papyrus is a copy);

(b) the edict may have been composed by a person other than Heliodorus

¹ *W.Chr.* 26 = Oliver 1989 no. 166.53-59.

² Cf. Bastianini 1975, 288; Bureth 1988, 484-485; Bastianini 1988, 508.

³ Cf. Bastianini 1975, 289; Bureth 1988, 485; Bastianini 1988, 508.

⁴ Cf. Bastianini 1975, 298; Bureth 1988, 487-488; Bastianini 1988, 510.

⁵ Cf. Bastianini 1975, 299; Bureth 1988, 488; Bastianini 1988, 510-511.

⁶ On P.Berl.Zill. 3 see Bastianini 1988, 510-511.

⁷ Cf. the use of a balanced sentence construction (ll. 19-20 τοῖς μὲν . . . τοῖς δέ), and paronomasia (l. 18 διὰ μεταδο[σ]ίμων μεταδῶ).

⁸ Cf. the use of εἰς instead of ἄν after the relative pronoun: for a full list of bibliographic references see Appendix (B) § 1.6 E (a) 2.

himself (a clerk ?);

(c) the occurrence may not be representative of Heliodorus' average attitude to purism and classical Greek.

Only if neither (a) nor (b) are true could we be certain that Heliodorus was personally responsible for the choice of that unclassical feature. And only if (c) is the case would we be confident that Heliodorus ignored purism.

On the other hand, an edict of Eudaemon, P.Oxy. II 237 col. viii 7-18, displays a case of $\tau\tau$ (l. 11) and the verb $\sigma\tilde{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ in combination with an acc. + inf. clause (l. 12). The latter complies with puristic requirements such as those stated by Moeris and Pseudo-Herodian (cf. § 1.3.5 no. B 1). The two elements thus make up a distinct puristic profile. Unfortunately, there is no telling whether Eudaemon composed the letter, nor is it possible to test the significance of the profile against further evidence. Only another edict of Eudaemon has so far been published, but the text is both fragmentary and uninformative about purism.¹ This does not allow us to determine whether the profile found in P.Oxy. 237 is representative of the chancery's normal attitude to purism, and therefore whether Eudaemon imparted puristic regulations to clerks employed in the prefectural chancery. Indeed, an argument against this possibility would be offered by the non-puristic, vulgar utterances put into Eudaemon's mouth in a report of judicial proceedings (§ 1.3.1.3.1). Yet I have suggested reasons for doubting the veracity of the linguistic data supplied by the papyrus.

Other sources provide unclear information. For instance, a famous edict of M. Sempronius Liberalis (in office AD 154-159), SB XX 14662,² displays an occurrence of the 3rd pers. plur. imp. ending $-\sigma\alpha\upsilon$ (l. 15). This standard Koine feature represents an offence against extreme purism (§ 1.3.5 no. B 6), but does not necessarily suggest an aversion for purism, since it is found both in non-Atticising sources and in prose texts which otherwise exhibit clear traces of intense puristic intervention. The imperial letters discussed in § 1.3.5 nos. B 6 and D 1 are cases in point: the former seems particularly significant because it is contemporary with Liberalis' edict. The ending $-\sigma\alpha\upsilon$ is a mere indicator of an unfavourable attitude to markedly archaising affectation. As imperial letters show, however, this attitude is precisely what one should expect of non-literary official documents. It remains doubtful whether the prefectural chancery in the time of Liberalis still accepted a moderate degree of purism or rather avoided all forms of puristic refinement.

¹ P. Mich. IX 522.

² S. Strassi Zaccaria, *L'editto di M. Sempronius Liberalis* (Trieste 1988) 20-22. On the prefecture of Liberalis see Bastianini 1975, 292-294; Bureth 1988, 486; Bastianini 1988, 509.

Chapter Three

Further Official Correspondence

1.3.7. The impact of purism on letters dispatched by other high-ranking offices in Egypt was generally limited. Many clerks appear to have consistently avoided puristic Greek, while others welcomed the use of light puristic colouring. Evidence on these tendencies is offered by the extensive corpus of homogeneous letters investigated in § 1.2.2.3.2.3.

(A) As has already been pointed out, dual endings, including $\delta\upsilon\omicron\iota\upsilon$ and $\delta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\upsilon$, were consistently disregarded by the clerk or clerks who composed official letters on behalf of the strategus of the Panopolite nome in September 298. Further evidence of non-puristic conduct is found in other letters written by the same individual(s), as follows (P.Panop.Beatty 1):

I. Offences against extreme purism:

1. 1. 22 (to the prefect, 11 Sept.) $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\omicron\nu$ in place of $\theta\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ (cf. § 1.2.1);
2. 1. 218 (to a commissioner of *annona*, 17 Sept.) $\sigma\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ for $\tau\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ (cf. § 1.3.2);
3. 1. 267 (to the procurator of the Lower Thebaid, 18 Sept.) $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\omicron\nu$;
4. 1. 390 (to a cavalryman, 22 Sept.) $\sigma\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$.

II. Offences against moderate purism:

1. 47 (to an accountant of Cohors I Apamenorum, 12 Sept.): cc for $\tau\tau$.

Elements of severe purism were consistently avoided. List II would seem to show that even moderate puristic colouring did not appeal to the clerk(s). The high rank of some of the recipients did not represent a sufficient stimulus to puristic intervention.

(B) Whilst agreeing with these letters on rejecting dual forms, official correspondence issued by the procurator of the Lower Thebaid in February 300 exhibits some consideration for purism (P.Panop.Beatty 2):

I. Features of severe purism:

1. 11. 95,99 (proclamation; unknown day) $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ (class.; not found in papyri before the late third century), cf. § 1.3.3 IV E no. (b) 1;
2. 1. 146 (circular letter to the strategi of the procuratorial district, 13 Feb.) $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$.

II. Features found even in moderately Atticising prose:

1. 1. 70 (to the strategus of the Panopolite nome, 9 Feb.) $\tau\tau$;
2. 1. 107 (circular letter to the strategi and commodores of the procuratorial district, 5 Feb.) $\tau\tau$.

III. Offences against extreme purism:

1. 7 (circular letter to the strategi of the procuratorial district, 2 Feb.) $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota\omicron\nu$ (cf. § 1.2.1).

II 1-2 suggest a desire for moderate puristic colouring. By contrast, severe purism was avoided: III reflects the same unfavourable attitude to intense puristic affectation as the use of plural forms in preference to uncommon dual endings (§ 1.2.2.3.2.3). Puristic features ranking midway between the top and mid-height in a hypothetical scale of puristic intensity elicited fluctuating responses. Some of them were accepted (I 1-2).

Chapter Three

Some others, such as dual endings of numerals, were rejected. Inconsistency is found even in one and the same letter: contrast I 2 above with § 1.2.2.3.2.3 no. B3.

These two basic tendencies could be illustrated from more papyri. I shall select a few examples. A letter of AD 300 from the catholicus to the procurator of the Lower Thebaid has an occurrence of *τέως* (P.Panop.Beatty 2. 139), just as the letters dispatched by the procurator ((B) I 1-2 above). Cases of mild revival of the dual were listed in § 1.2.2.3.2.3. On the other hand, P.Oxy. LX 4060.40-64, a copy of a letter of AD 161 from the strategus of Nesyt to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome, displays a case of *cc* (l. 48) and other post-classical features, including an instance of *ὅν* after the relative pronoun (l. 48).¹ It is regrettably impossible to reconstruct the normal linguistic behaviour of the clerks who composed these letters. This does not allow us to determine how their (non-)puristic profile compares with the *average* practice of purism of the chanceries from which the letters were dispatched. No firm assessment of their profile is possible under such conditions.² Similar problems affect the vast majority of official letters. P.Panop. Beatty 1 and 2, on the other hand, contain such extensive sets of homogeneous letters (in terms of date and 'authorship') as to allow more secure conclusions to be drawn. As indicated earlier, letters issued by the strategus of the Panopolite nome exhibit no rational, purposeful and planned intervention in language, possibly because they were written down under dictation (§ 1.2.2.3.2.3). Their non-puristic profile is primarily a function of the absence of an ambition for linguistic refinement. On the other hand, the reception of puristic colouring in the letters of the procurator of the Lower Thebaid suits their predominantly artificial style. Perhaps genre influenced the choice of the profile (cf. § 1.2.2.3.2.3).

Conclusion

1.3.8. A few points of general interest can be highlighted.

(A) Types of Puristic Profile

Non-literary sources document a large variety of profiles of puristic intensity. The following classification represents an attempt to illustrate the principal typological variations found in the papyri discussed in previous paragraphs. Each profile will receive a serial number. In each entry, I shall provide:

- an outline of the main characteristics of the profile (C): (a) defines the approximate weighting of non-puristic factors, whereas (b) highlights the

¹ On this feature see Appendix (B) § 1.6 E (a) 2.

² Cf. § 1.2.2.3.2.3.

Chapter Three

attitude to unintegrated puristic variants. As brief compositions such as the non-literary papyri provide only limited information on the practice of purism, we can offer only an approximate estimate of the degrees of interaction between puristic and non-puristic variants;

- indication of the types of document in which the particular profile under consideration is found (*F*).

An asterisk (*) will indicate profile configurations which might have been affected by scribal inaccuracies. The sign (^) will be used as a marker of profiles in which the assessment of the overall impact of purism is affected by uncertainties about the puristic status of one or more feature. Sources characterised by very dubious profiles, however, will not be taken into consideration.

(I) Unadulterated high-level profiles:

1. *C*: (a) full disregard;
(b) thorough reception; distinct ambition for intense affectation.

F: forensic oratory only (§ 1.3.1.2).

- 1a. *C*: as in no. 1, but intense affectation is either unattested or deliberately rejected.

F: (α) private correspondence (§ 1.3.3 (I));

(β) petitions (§ 1.3.4 nos. A2 & A3);

(γ) imperial correspondence (§ 1.3.5 nos. B 9^).

(II) Mixed profiles characterised by the complementary use of non-puristic factors and high profile items:

2. *C*: (a) limited acceptance;
(b) extensive reception; items contributing intense affectation are either unattested or avoided;

F: (α) imperial correspondence (§ 1.3.5 no. D 1);

(β) *declamations (§ 1.3.2);

(γ) utterances of presiding officials in judicial proceedings (§ 1.3.1.3.1*^).

3. *C*: (a) isolated acceptance;
(b) isolated reception.

F: petitions (§ 1.3.4 no. B1*)

4. *C*: (a) fluctuating attitude;
(b) occasional reception;

F: (α) (exercise in) forensic oratory (§ 1.3.1.1);

(β) 'narratio' documents (§ 1.3.1.3 (A));

(γ) private correspondence (§§ 1.2.2.3.2.2 [PSI IV 286, SB VI 9616v.24], 1.3.3 III B, IV E (?)).

5. *C*: (a) extensive acceptance;

(b) occasional reception;

F: official letters issued by local authorities (§ 1.3.7 (B)).

These profiles exhibit widely varied ratios of non-puristic versus high-profile puristic items. This posits the existence of varying attitudes to marked puristic respectability. No. 2 points to ambition for more intense purism than no. 5 and should probably be regarded as a high level profile stained with lapses into non-puristic language. By contrast, nos. 4 and 5 can be described as moderate profiles characterised by occasional acceptance of high profile items.

(III) Moderate level profiles:

6. *C*: (a) partial or total rejection (no firm distinction between different attitudes is possible); well-integrated puristic features are welcomed;

(b) thorough disregard or mere absence of occurrences;

F: (α) imperial correspondence (§ 1.3.5 nos. C 1, C 2);

(β) private letters (§ 1.3.3 (III A), (III C), (IV) (except perhaps IV E, see no. 4 above);

(γ) prefectural decrees (§ 1.3.6).

(IV) Finally, although displaying no profile proper, some sources exhibit isolated occurrences of high profile items. Examples are found among imperial letters (§ 1.3.5 nos. B 5) and petitions (§ 1.3.4 nos. A1, B2, B3). Writers clearly sought to achieve eye-catching puristic colouring.

(B) Puristic Profiles and Performance

Modern languages display 'a dichotomy between, on the one hand, neutral, conventional, formal, premeditated language behaviour in which purism is an important constituent and relaxed, informal, spontaneous performance characterised by a relaxation of puristic strictures on the other'.¹ This state of affairs has been shown specifically to pertain to certain types of puristic orientation such as élitist purism, 'where the impetus is precisely on elevating the language above, or distancing it from, an embarrassing vernacular'.² Ancient Greek purism was essentially as much élitist as it was archaising in nature inasmuch as its desire to resuscitate the linguistic material of a past golden age embodied a proscriptive attitude not only to substandard and regional usage, but also to words of standard language which were not attested in the accepted archaic models.³ As we have seen, puristic activity was often a function of premeditated

¹ G. Thomas 1991, 132.

² G. Thomas 1991, 132.

³ On the relationship between élitist and archaising purism see G. Thomas 1991, 78-79.

Chapter Three

language behaviour. Examples of this correlation have been found among 'narratio' documents (§ 1.3.1.3(A)), written records of utterances of judges (§ 1.3.1.3.1), declamations (§ 1.3.2), private letters (§ 1.3.3 I, III A-C, IV), petitions (§ 1.3.4 A), and imperial correspondence (§ 1.3.5 no. B 5). Yet this mode of activity was not the rule. A number of private letters and petitions show that purism could and did on occasion have a marked impact on otherwise unartificial prose (cf. §§ 1.3.3 IV, 1.3.4 B). In particular, sources occur which are characterised by unsophisticated styles (§ 1.3.4 nos. B2, B3; cf. A IV above) or even careless sentence construction (§ 1.3.4 no. B1: puristic profile 3) but still exhibit occasional occurrences of high-profile puristic features. It follows that even casual performance did not necessarily elicit a considerable relaxation of puristic strictures. It may be noted, however, that the present evidence does not document any case of an informal composition marked by such high-level puristic profiles as nos. 1 and 1a. This fact suggests that intense puristic affectation characterised by *thorough* acceptance of both well-integrated puristic features and high profile items was indeed a product of premeditated performance. It seems, therefore, that the relaxation of puristic self-censure affected the weighting of non-puristic factors more deeply than the attitude to unassimilated high-profile items.

(C) Determinants of Usage

In the course of previous paragraphs, attempts were made to examine the factors which may have influenced the choice of individual profiles. The evidence discussed does not suffice to enable us to draw conclusions of general validity. Several issues also make it impossible to obtain extensive sets of firm data and therefore to detect trends. First, in many cases the impact of purism cannot be assessed on secure grounds owing to uncertainties about the veracity of transmitted readings and the classification of controversial linguistic material. Secondly, only in a minority of cases can the determinants of performance be detected. Thirdly, the choice of each profile was generally influenced by more than one factor. The complementary interaction of genre and time in the forensic speech examined in § 1.3.1.2 is a case in point. Moreover, there is reason to believe that more than two factors often influenced puristic conduct. It is impossible, however, to detect all the determinants of every written performance. In the vast majority of cases, assessments are bound to rest on dubious speculation.

In this connection, it seems fit to offer comments on the commonplace assumption that the language of official documents and that of private documents

differ in their degree of correctness, formality, artificiality, and cultivation.¹ This general proposition comprises two further assumptions:

- (i) that individuals were either required or expected to adjust *every aspect of language and style* according to the private or official character of performance;
- (ii) that *both inscriptions and papyri* are characterised by a dichotomy between private and official documents; in other words, that the same principle of conduct was in operation in all geographical areas (Egypt, Asia Minor, Attica, etc.) and that it was unrelated to the writing surface.

In part, this belief reflects a categorisation found in ancient rhetoric. According to Latin epistolary theorists, for instance, *epistulae negotiales* required different stylistic choices from *epistulae familiares* (Ch. II § 2.2.1 III i 1). Yet neither (i) nor (ii) have yet been subjected to methodologically correct testing against an extensive body of papyrus evidence. As a result, we do not ^{know} to what extent the notions of private and official were effectively present to the writers' mind as determinants of composition. The ancient practice of purism in fact invites revision of the assumption.

Assessments should be undertaken of the effects of the dichotomy private/official on:

- (a) the use of puristic features
- and (b) the extent of their usage.

In particular, three aspects require due consideration:

- (1) the choice of the profile;
- (2) the attitude to high profile items;
- (3) the attitude to moderate profile features.

Evidence shows that (2) did not vary according to the private or public character of performance. Remarkable features of extreme purism are found in private letters (§§ 1.2.1.2.3, 1.2.2.3.2.2, 1.3.3) and even in private documents (§ 1.2.2.3.1). Moreover, official correspondence does not exhibit a higher frequency of high profile items than private correspondence. It follows that higher level profiles are neither alien to private letters (cf. (A) nos. 1a, 4 above) nor statistically more frequent in official correspondence. Similar considerations apply to (3). Many private letters, including unsophisticated items, are characterised by the presence of moderate profile features and by a moderately puristic impact (§ 1.2.3; cf. (A) no. 6; (B)). There is evidence to show that the normal epistolary practice of certain high-ranking official chanceries included the use

¹ Cf. e.g. Bittenwieser, *IF* 28 (1911) 16-106; Kaimio 1979, 168; Gil 1987, 83; Bubeník 1989, 31, 37, 39-40; Horsley 1989, 48; Brixhe-Hodot 1993, 11-12.

of puristic variants (§ 1.3.7 (B)). But other high-ranking chanceries normally ignored purism (§ 1.3.7 (A)). Of course, it is not certain that every occurrence of moderate profile items in unpretentious private letters represents an indicator of puristic intervention. But the same issue applies to official correspondence as well. If attempts are made to go beyond an analysis of individual cases and to detect trends, only inconclusive data are obtained. Data about individual clusters of equivalent variants are generally insufficient to allow statistically significant tests to be carried out. Moreover, where official and private letters differ in their ratio of puristic : non-puristic variants, the divergence generally bears no statistic significance. In such cases, mere word-frequency is inconsequential. Indeed, very frequent items such as $\tau\tau$ /cc could be more informative. It has recently been stated that $\tau\tau$ predominates in official papyrus documents,¹ but I have not been able to verify either the set of data on which the assertion is based or the chosen criteria of analysis. The latter seem particularly important. Firstly, it is unclear whether heterogeneous types of sources such as declarations addressed to officials, letters dispatched by officials, and even imperial correspondence have been classified together under the category 'official documents'. If this is the case, the collected data may provide misleading information. Secondly, writers were often inconstant in their use of puristic features. When dealing with an isolated document, we can never tell to what extent it is representative of the writer's normal attitude to purism. It may thus be misleading to combine data from a variety of such sources. In collecting data, it would be advisable to distinguish between loose sources and homogeneous groups of items illustrating the average practice of individuals and chanceries.

To conclude, neither the use of purism nor the extent of its usage seem to have significantly varied according to the official or private character of sources. Further investigation into other linguistic areas is called for.

(D) Problems of Chronological Development

The complexity of issues makes it also impossible to determine whether and to what extent the impact of purism on non-literary prose varied in the course of centuries. It is hard to tell, for example, to what extent the full manifestation of Atticism in the second century AD contributed to the reception of purism by the Graeco-Egyptian speech community. Certainly purism did not represent a nascent phenomenon in the second century. An early first-century oratorical speech composed in Fayum has a distinct puristic profile (§ 1.3.1.1), and there are instances of marked puristic intervention in

¹ So e.g. Horsley 1989, 48.

Chapter Three

first-century letters and contracts (§§ 1.2.2.3.1 no. 1, 1.2.2.3.2.3 no. 1). Yet to what extent the blooming of linguistic Atticism entailed a more intense stimulus to puristic activity it is hard to tell. The choice of a very high puristic profile in a second-/third-century forensic speech is probably a reflection of that phenomenon (§ 1.3.1.2). Atticism appears to have influenced the premeditated language behaviour of well-educated individuals. The reaction of the speech community, on the other hand, is difficult to assess. There are many second- and early third-century cases of puristic intervention,¹ but whether they indicate that purism had enjoyed some propagation in the wider community it is hard to tell.

¹ Cf. §§ 1.2.1.2.4, 1.2.2.3.1 (nos. 2-4), 1.2.2.3.2.4 (nos. 1-2), 1.3.3 (no. III B), 1.3.6.

2. THE USE OF POETICISMS

2.0. Poetic language is another fundamental component of premeditated language behaviour inasmuch as it generally consists of highly de-automatised linguistic acts.¹ In the Roman period, the prosaic use of elements characteristic of poetic language was proscribed by severe purists.² Yet not only had authorities of milder puristic orientation a more favourable attitude to it, but poetic loans successfully pervaded written usage, though in varying proportions. No literary prose writing was in fact exempt from the influence of poetic language. This is true even of strongly Atticising writers such as Aelius Aristides.³ In the fourth century, an influential rhetor like Himerius came to adopt a highly poetic style in his orations.⁴ Other intellectuals were averse to his approach,⁵ but this is illustrative of the high esteem in which poetry was held by rhetors. As a matter of fact, the study of poets played an important role in the rhetorical training of pupils throughout Graeco-Roman antiquity.⁶ In Egypt, educated people also took much interest in poetry, and many of them must have had remarkable knowledge of it. Although the diffusion of verse manuscripts seems to have peaked in the late first to third centuries AD, papyri document the existence of an interest in poetry down to the sixth and seventh centuries.⁷ In consequence either of formal rhetorical training or of personal poetic interests and leanings, Greek-speaking people in Egypt occasionally adopted loans from poetic language into their own everyday prose. The question is to examine the occasions on which these items were adopted, and also the proportions and motivations of the borrowing.

The influence of poetic language on the non-literary papyri was investigated by Henrik Zilliacus thirty years ago.⁸ He collected a number of poetic echoes, compiled a list of supposedly poetic words attested in the documentary papyri, and advanced some general observations. Unfortunately, his word-list is not free of

¹ Cf. J. Mukařovský, 'Standard Language and Poetic Language', in D.C. Freeman (ed.), *Linguistics and Literary Style* (New York 1970) 43.

² Cf. e.g. Phryn. *Ecl.* 32, 66, 106, 214, 247, 251, 294 Fischer.

³ Cf. Schmid II 187-213; S. Nicosia, in R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili*, III (Rome 1993) 1124-1125.

⁴ Cf. Norden 1958, I 428-431.

⁵ Cf. Iul. ep. 4.428b, p. 14.8-9 Bidez (the letter is addressed to the rhetor Evagrius).

⁶ Cf. H. North, *Traditio* 8 (1952) 1-33.

⁷ Cf. H. Maehler, *Dialogos* 4 (1997) 125-130.

⁸ Zilliacus 1967, 68-83.

Chapter Three

inaccuracies,¹ and both his analysis of evidence and his observations lack depth. I also question the poetic status of many of the features which Zilliacus and others have regarded as poeticisms. In the next pages, I shall thus offer a new discussion of select aspects of the phenomenon. I shall first address problems of classification. This will hopefully give some indication of my views on the necessary criteria for labelling individual linguistic features as 'poetic' in the periods of Koine. Secondly, while giving up to compile a new word-list, I shall attempt to illustrate the main patterns of conduct with regard to poetic language and the principal motives behind the choice of poetic ingredients. It has recently been pointed out with good reason that a chief goal in the study of poeticisms is to 'look for explanations of poetic colouring in particular instances'.² The importance of context in the study of literary style needs hardly be emphasised. It may be interesting to recall what John Spencer and Michael Gregory wrote three decades ago: 'Language events do not take place in isolation from other events; rather they operate within a wide framework of human activity. Any piece of language is therefore part of a situation, and so has a context, a relationship with that situation'.³ This seems to be true as long as we take the term 'situation' to denote not only the external conditions in which the performance takes place, but also the psychological context from which it originates. It will be apparent that poetic loans could be related not so much to external determinants (genre, recipient, linguistic context etc.) as to incidental psychological motivations.

¹ Two major examples: P. Cair. Masp. III 67331, said to provide the only cases of αἰθαλόεις and ἀμαλλοδετήρ in documents (Zilliacus 1967, 73, 75), is in fact part of a codex containing *Scholia minora* to *Iliad* (Pack² 1171 = Raffaelli 1984, 150 no. 027. Cf. now Fournet 1997, 229-301): αἰθαλόεν (fr. I r 3) is a lemma taken from *Il.* 2. 415; ἀμαλλοδετήρες (fr. III v 1) comes from *Il.* 18.553.

² Dover 1997, 103.

³ J. Spencer - M.J. Gregory, 'An Approach to the Study of Style', in D.C. Freeman (ed.), *Linguistics and Literary Style* (New York 1970) 75.

2.1. PROBLEMS OF CLASSIFICATION

2.1.1. When investigating the influence of poetic language on post-classical Greek prose, the preliminary problem is to distinguish linguistic items which involve premeditated acts allusive to poetry from apparent poeticisms, that is, from items whose use presupposes either fully automatised linguistic acts or deliberate reception of standard literary prose language. 'It would be pointless, even misleading — writes Sir Kenneth Dover *à propos* of Attic Greek — to call any phenomenon 'poetic' simply on the grounds that it happens to occur in extant poetry but not in extant prose'.¹ Moreover, in the light of the evolution of Greek prose style during the Koine periods it would be misleading to label as 'poetic' any phenomenon which occurs in classical poetry, irrespective of the extent of its re-use in prose, both classical and post-classical. Unless we can determine that the phenomenon under consideration was inspired by a known poetic passage, we must look for circumstantial arguments in support of its supposedly poetic connotation. First, we need to specify what lexeme or periphrasis or syntactical construction a Greek-speaking individual in Roman Egypt would have used instead in his ordinary discourse.² Secondly, we need to make sure that the phenomenon under consideration enjoyed no extensive integration into literary Koine prose, since in that case it is impossible to determine whether it was the poetic resonance or the propagation in literature to influence the choice of writers. Thirdly, we need to make sure that the phenomenon was not inspired by the language of Attic prose. Failure to follow this procedure may result in mistaken assessments. I shall discuss some exemplary cases in illustration of this methodology and the danger of error to which hasty assessments of the data are liable.

Poetic Language or Non-Poetic Literary Language ?

2.1.2. The verb προσφθέγγομαι occurs occasionally in papyri, but always in Byzantine epistolary formulae in the sense 'greet', and therefore as a synonym for more common verbs such as ἀσπάζομαι and προσαγορεύω: cf. SB V 7635.6 = O' Callaghan 1963 no. 62 (late v - early vi AD),³ P. Fouad 83.8,9,10 (vi AD), 88.4 (vi AD). The same

¹ Dover 1997, 98.

² I have paraphrased an important methodological suggestion formulated by Dover 1997, 98-99.

³ In this context, the sense 'address' is also possible.

Chapter Three

usage is very common in late antique and Byzantine 'literary' epistolography.¹ Compare the following parallels:

Greg. Naz. *epp.* 128.1; 132.2; 133.2; 168.2; 224.5 Gallay, GCS — Const. imp. *ep. ad Arium et Arian.* 22, ed. Opitz, *Athanasius. Werke* III 1 p. 72.12 (*ap.* Athanas. *De decr. Nic. Syn.* 40.22, II 1 p. 40.35 Opitz and Gelas. 3.19) — Basil. Caes. *epp.* 15.7, 19.7, 20.18, 59.1.3-4, 119.2, 121.7, 132.10, 133.14-15, 155.12, 205.6-7, 206.4, 231.13, 239.1.3, 263.12, 265.3.30, 297.7, 305.14, 324.2 Courtonne — Io. Ant. *ep. ad Cyrill. Alex.*, ACO I 1.1 p. 119.17 (= Cyrill. *Apolog. ad Theodos.* 20, ACO I 1.3 p. 84.25-26); *ep. ad Maxim. episc. Const.*, ACO I 1.7 p. 160.23 — Theodor. Cyr. *epp.* (*Coll. Patm.*) 18 p. 90.1, 46 p. 111.18, 49 p. 119.22, Azéma², SChr 40; *epp.* (*Coll. Sirm.*) 4 p. 30.10, 5 p. 30.19, 25 p. 84.6, 26 p. 84.15, 40 p. 106.4, 41 p. 106.19, 55 p. 132.14, 56 p. 132.20, 62 p. 142.9-10, 64 p. 144.19, 72 p. 158.9, 87 p. 232.12, 93 p. 244.13 Azéma, SChr 98; 106 p. 30.14, 108 p. 32.22, 143 p. 156.10 Azéma, SChr 111 — Leo *ep. ad Faust.*, ACO II 1.1 p. 37.28 — Felix *ep. ad Zenon. imp.*, ACO III 24.38 — Aen. Gaz. *epp.* 11.9, 24.17 Massa Positano.

Zilliagus (1967, 81) emphasised the poetic connotation of the verb. We could add that προσφθέγγομαι supplies evidence of the influence of poetry on the language of Byzantine letter-writing. Yet individual letter-writers are likely to have derived it from the lexical repertoire of contemporary epistolography, and not from poetry. They used it to add a touch of formality, but not a specifically poetic touch. Indeed, a writer steeped in poetry could recognise the poetic resonance of the verb, but this awareness can barely have represented the primary stimulus to its employment in personal letters.

Let us now consider a more difficult item, viz. the adjective ἀκήρατος. Of its two papyrus occurrences listed by Zilliagus (1967, 74), one is found in SB III 7205.8, a late third-century petition to the *praeses* of the Thebaid or to the prefect of Egypt,² while the other occurs in P.Lips. 119v col. ii 3, a rhetorically-phrased document of uncertain type,³ written in AD 273 (BL IX 125) or 274 (BL I 216). The adjective was fairly common in literary prose of the third and fourth centuries: occurrences, for instance, are found in Clement of Alexandria (14x), Alexander of Aphrodisia (1x), Themistius (12x), Amphilochius of Iconium (3x), and Himerius (3x).⁴ In some cases, its use was inspired by known poetic passages, whereas different, though often unclear, motivations seem to have influenced writers in other circumstances. In SB 7205, the adjective occurs in a parenthetical phrase (ἀκήρατοί σου αἱ ἀκοαί) which has the appearance of a quotation or an adaptation of a model. Whether this was written in verse or prose, however, we cannot tell. On the other hand, ἀκήρατος is employed in the

¹ Cf. Tomadakes 1969-1970, 50. No ex. is listed by either Lampe or Sophocles.

² On this issue cf. Wagner 1987, 266. The papyrus belongs to the private archive of a family of *nekrotaphoi* from the Great Oasis: cf. Montevicchi 1988, 256 no. 53.

³ Cf. L. Mitteis, *P.Lips.* (1906) p. 324; Wilcken, *APF* 3 (1906) 569.

⁴ Cf. also Lampe *s.v.*

Leipzig papyrus to qualify the μεγαλοδωρία ('munificence') of the emperor Aurelian. That the adjective was derived from a specific poetic passage is improbable, but was it used in view of its poetic resonance? Alternatively, considering its diffusion in contemporary literary prose, did it strike the writer as literary?

Poetic Language or Ordinary Speech?

2.1.3. In pre-Hellenistic literature, the lexeme γραῖα 'old woman' was confined to poetry (Homer, tragedy), its ordinary equivalent in prose being γραῦς. γραῖα has so far surfaced in four texts from Roman and late Roman Egypt. Three of them are private letters (P.Oxy. XXXVIII 2860.11 [ii AD], P.Münch. III (1) 120.15 [ii AD], P.Oxy. LIX 3997.42 [iii/iv AD]), one is a text of uncertain nature (O.Amst. 85.11 [ii AD]).¹ It would be unwise to assume that the individuals who wrote these documents consciously introduced an element of poetic language into everyday prose.² The lexeme γραῖα in fact propagated into post-classical popular speech,³ as is shown by:

- (i) the occurrences in bilingual glossaries (CGL II 534.11, III 329.10, 512.44);
- (ii) the fact that Moeris labelled it as 'Hellenistic' (193.29 Bekker);
- (iii) the existence of γριά in MGr (Demetrakos II 1687 s.v. γραῖα; cf. II 1702-1703 s.v. γριά).

The presence of the lexeme in ordinary discourse — perhaps in wider use than we might suppose on the basis of the present evidence — strongly suggests that those individuals performed automatised acts receptive to the language of everyday speech.⁴ The otherwise unsophisticated style and unartificial language of the papyri, particularly of P.Münch. 120, support the conclusion.

We can now proceed to consider a more difficult item, viz. the lexeme ὄμμα 'eye'. In classical Greek, the comparative ratio of ὀφθαλμός : ὄμμα in prose and poetry indicates that the latter was essentially poetic. Yet an examination of individual contexts has shown that the use of ὄμμα in Attic prose was not always determined by a specific desire to make a display of poetic colouring.⁵ The word is found in Koine prose of all stylistic levels. In the form (ὀμ)μάτι(ον), it is still in use in Modern Greek, where it has largely replaced ὀφθαλμός.⁶ During the Koine periods, ὄμμα could strike a well-

¹ On O.Amst. 85 see J. Shelton, ZPE 33 (1979) 224.

² So apparently H.G. Ioannidou, P.Oxy. LIX (1992) p. 141.

³ Cf. DELG s.v. γραῦς; Shipp 1979, 201.

⁴ Cf. M.E. Weinstein, P.Oxy. XXXVIII (1971) p. 88.

⁵ On all this cf. Dover 1997, 113.

⁶ Cf. Demetrakos VI 5121; DELG s.v. ὄπωμα; Shipp 1979, 415, 426.

educated individual as:

- (a) poetic;
- (b) good Attic (in view of its occurrences in prose);
- (c) standard literary;
- (d) ordinary and unsophisticated.

It is impossible to identify the particular resonance of the lexeme in every context. The metaphorical expression 'eye of the soul' (ὄμμα(τα) τῆς ψυχῆς) stems from Plato (cf. *Resp.* 7. 533 d, *Soph.* 254 a), but its wide diffusion in post-classical literature (Philo, Plutarch, Clement of Rome, Clement of Alexandria, Plotinus, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Basil of Caesarea) suggests that it became a fairly common expression.¹ Under such conditions, it would be unwise to take for granted an ubiquitous influence of Plato. The (d) connotation may account for the non-metaphorical use of ὄμμα instead of ὀφθαλμός in unpretentious prose, including the *NT*² and low-level papyrus letters such as P.Brem. 64.8 (ii AD). But in theory, other motivations may have operated even in such circumstances, inasmuch as casual performances could still incorporate isolated cases of choice vocabulary. Greater difficulties affect the evaluation of occurrences of the non-metaphorical sense in literary prose. The linguist has to confront textual uncertainties³ and can on no occasion base his assessment of the lexeme on firm grounds. Scholars generally assume that writers recognised ὄμμα as poetic,⁴ but was this always the case? Can we really exclude the possibility that (b), (c), and even (d) influenced the writers' conduct on one or other occasion?

2.1.3.1. Further issues are raised by isolated occurrences of dialect forms in the papyri. The antiquarian interest characteristic of the early Roman period led to the propagation of old Greek dialects in areas of the eastern part of the Empire where they had long been spoken before the formation of Koine and its rise as the standard language.⁵ This phenomenon consisted of either an artificial revival of a dialect which had ceased to be spoken,⁶ or an artificial elevation to written official use of a dialect

¹ Materials: Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ὄμμα 2; M. Naldini, *Basilio di Cesarea. Discorso ai giovani* (Florence 1984) 150-151 (with further bibliography). Naldini correctly emphasised the uncertainties inherent in the stylistic evaluation of the expression.

² Materials: Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ὄμμα 1.

³ MSS are occasionally divided between ὄμμα and ὀφθαλμός; cf. e.g. Inglese 1996, 168.

⁴ Cf. Schmid I 340, III 212, IV 319; Gallay 1933, 76; Inglese 1996, 32 n. 75, 168. Way 1927, 168 regarded the lexeme as a rare word.

⁵ For a comprehensive study see Bubeník 1989, 73-174.

⁶ The revival of Aeolic in Asia Minor is probably a case in point: cf. Schmitt 1977, 78-79, 80; A.C. Cassio, *AION (ling)* 8 (1986) 131-146; Bubeník 1989, 138 ff.; Hodot 1990, 22-23.

which had survived as the language spoken and partly written by the common people for private purposes.¹ In Egypt, where no ancient Greek dialect had been in use before the propagation of Koine, this phenomenon was not active. Indeed, dialect endings characteristic of poetry were occasionally introduced into non-literary papyrus compositions from a desire to invest everyday prose with marked poetic colouring (§ 2.2.2; cf. § 2.3.1). But there is no reason to assume that any phenomenon which happens to be reminiscent of an old dialect feature presupposes some form of conscious intervention in language use. For instance, the occurrence of ἤκουκα in P.Giss. Univ. III 31 (ll. 21-22), a fourth-century unpretentious private letter, is unlikely to have been influenced by Doric ἄκουκα.² If the reading is correct, that form may be either a scribal slip for ἤκουσα or a late formation attributable to the influence of aor. ἤκουσα (on the analogy of ἠρώτησα-ἠρώτηκα and the like)³ or of perf. pass. ἤκουσμαι. Similarly, the sporadic cases of dative plural in -εσσι ⁴ are unlikely to be the result of deliberate decisions to revive the old Aeolic ending, possibly under the influence of poetry. Gignac (II 48) seems correct in taking this ending as a late analogical formation.

Poetic or Attic ?

2.1.4. Uncertainties about the classification of items which were uncommon in all stylistic registers of Koine may also be caused by their particular pattern of distribution in classical Greek. PSI VI 685 (c. AD 324-327 ?), for example, displays an occurrence of οἴσθας (l. 3), a form apparently confined to verse, including comedy and mime.⁵ Undoubtedly, this is a choice form: no other occurrence of the same ending has yet surfaced in Roman and Byzantine papyri (cf. Gignac II 410), nor is it apparently

-
- ¹ Laconian seems to be an exemplary case, see É. Bourguet, *Le dialecte laconien* (Coll. Linguist. 23, Paris 1927) 23 ff. (esp. 26); Bubeník 1989, 73 ff., who pointed out, however, that even in Laconia there may have been cases of artificial use of the dialect. In any case, evidence of late Laconian as a living language is supplied by the dialectal dedicatory inscriptions collected and (re-)published by A.M. Woodward in R.M. Dawkins (ed.), *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta* (The Soc. for the Prom. of Hell. St. - Suppl. Pap. 5, London 1929) 296-374, see C.D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago-London 1955, repr. 1973) 272-273 (cf. 176 and 180). Cf. also Schmitt 1977, 56-57 with further bibliography.
- ² Gignac II 299 labels it as 'a variant of the Doric and Laconian ἄκουκα'; similarly Crönert 1903, 244 n. 3. It is not clear, however, whether their terminology is genetic or descriptive.
- ³ So Mandilaras 1973, 203 n. 1 on ἤκουκένοι, which was wrongly (Gignac II 299 n. 3) read in P. Oxy. II 237 col. vii 23.
- ⁴ Cf. Gignac II 47-48.
- ⁵ See Kühner-Blass II 44,241; Schwyzler I 662 (with further bibliography); Veitch 1887 s.v. εἶδέω; LSJ s.v. εἶδω B. An occurrence has surfaced in a third-century BC papyrus (P.Cair.Zen. II 59207.33; cf. Mayser I 2, p. 81.17).

Chapter Three

found in contemporary unpretentious Koine literature, whereas οἶδας was the standard form in post-classical Greek (§ 1.3.3(I)). The stylistic status of οἶσθας is unclear. It may well have been considered poetic, but in view of its occurrences in comedy it may equally have struck the writer as an old Attic form: note that Herodian (*Περὶ ὀρθογρ.* II 559.13 Lentz = Hesych. ο 396 Latte) regarded it as a good Attic formation.¹ Alternatively, it might simply represent the mistaken result of an attempt to use the old-fashioned form οἶσθα, perhaps under the influence of οἶδας.

¹ Aelius Dionysius (o 11 Erbse) states that οἶσθας was used 'either because of metre or to avoid clashes between vowels'. Does he refer to poetic or prosaic hiatus?

2.2. PATTERNS OF USAGE

2.2.1. In order to define the use of poeticisms in non-literary sources and to make an attempt at detecting motivations, we need to examine:

1. the extent to which features of poetic language are adopted into every text;
2. whether there are concentrations of poetic ingredients in particular contexts;
3. whether poetic loans are linked to context;
4. the general attitude of writers to poetic ingredients.

In general, the more systematic the borrowing from poetic language, the greater will be the level of poetic resonance of language. Yet even where poetic loans were extensively adopted, the poetic character of performance varies according to whether they concentrate in a particular context or not. Patterns of usage are ultimately dependent on the attitude of writers. An individual who wished to invest his prose performance with poetic colour could be either sparing or lavish of poeticisms. Moreover, he could restrict poetic loans to specific circumstances, or could avoid concentrations of poetic ingredients, or could set no particular restriction to himself. Poetic loans could be chosen to perform different roles ranging from the strictly functional to the strictly aesthetic. This suggests that a wide range of possible factors influenced the writers' conduct. The ideal goal would be to determine the behaviour of each individual on the basis of a large number of sources. This would allow us to come to general conclusions as to the attitude of the educated speech community in a particular period. Given the highly heterogeneous character of the non-literary papyri (Ch. I § 3.1.3), however, it is impossible to assess the normal practice of any individual but a single man active in the sixth century (see § 2.2.4).

2.2.2. There is evidence to show that the prosaic re-use of poetic language could be a function of subject. In P.Oxy. VII 1070 (= Tibiletti 1979 no. 16), a late third-century private letter, a secure occurrence of the poetic ending -οισι (ἄνθρώποισι) is found in a cretic *clausula* (cr[~] + cr) (l. 11) at the end of a high-flown invocation to Sarapis (cf. Ch. IV § 1.1.1). Poetic style was clearly used to invest prose performance with an aura of religious solemnity appropriate to context.¹ The poetic resonance inherent in the old-fashioned dialect form greatly contributes to the poetic character of the passage; at the same time, the ending provides it with the desired rhythm.

In SB XIV 11717, a fourth-century 'narratio' document,² the individual who

¹ For similar phenomena in classical prose see Dover 1997, 109.

² On this class of documents see § 1.3.1.3.

prepared the minutes of the presentation of the legal case used a one-line iambic sentence to comment upon his client's misfortune: καὶ ταῦτά περ προξένησεν αὐτῷ ἡ τύχη (col. ii 29-30) (3 ia. with -τα περ προ- = √ √ - [second foot] ? Or five-foot iambic sequence starting from περ ?). προξενέω with the accusative of object and the dative of person is a lexical characteristic of literary language, and the particle περ after ταῦτα is a poetic feature alien to prose of any time and stylistic register. The poetic rhythm is a function of subject: short moral sentences were traditionally written in iambic trimeters. The loan from poetic language was taken over as an ingredient contributing to the poetic character of the passage. The problem is to define the precise role of the writer in the composition of the sentence. Both its present form and its rhythm are undoubtedly due to him, since ταῦτα and αὐτῷ refer to the case to be debated during court-room proceedings. But it is unclear whether he composed the line in its entirety or adapted a model to context. The readings αὐτῷ ἡ and καὶ ταῦτα might have replaced original readings such as (respectively) ἀνθρώποις and λύπας, βλάβας (cf. *Comp. Men. & Phil.* 4.15 Jäkel) and the like. Yet this possibility does not suffice to prove the existence of a model. It is thus unclear whether the particle περ originated from the writer's mind or from a model.

The papyrus displays more evidence of language cultivation ¹ but no equal consideration of poetic style. Another moral saying occurs at col. ii 24. Its thought could be paralleled from well-known iambic sentences (cf. *Men. Mon.* 708, *Comp. Men. & Phil.* I 91 Jäkel), but its form is not metrical, nor does any other specifically poetic feature occur. These two facts are reciprocally unrelated. The sentence is incorporated into a longer syntactic unit. The re-working consequent upon the decision to turn its originally aphoristic shape into a genitive absolute might have entailed the loss of the poetic rhythm; it may be noted that the metrical sentence at ll. 29-30 represents an independent clause. The vocabulary, on the other hand, does not significantly diverge from the metrical parallels. The writer simply refrained, whether deliberately or instinctively, from introducing supplementary poetic ingredients.

2.2.3. Papyri also document solitary occurrences of poetic loans unrelated to context. In favourable circumstances, the motivation of the borrowing can be detected with reasonable confidence. Sometimes the use of isolated poetic features appears to be a function of the writer's fondness for poetry (§ 2.2.4.2). On other occasions, extemporaneous psychological motivations seem to have played a major role (§ 2.3). In many cases, however, it is very difficult to detect the motive behind the choice. Let us

¹ For instance, in the clause following upon the iambic sentence, the writer used the classical lexeme ἀνδράποδον in the sense 'slave' instead of usual δοῦλος (l. 30).

assume, for instance, that οἶσθας in PSI VI 685.3, a petition to the prefect of Egypt of c. AD 324-327 (?), was recognised as poetic.¹ The text displays an unbalanced level of literary refinement. A rhetorical construction characterised by alliteration and anaphora is found at l. 9 (ἐφήμερον τροφὴν ἐφευρίσκων), but elsewhere the style is much less elaborate. Even οἶσθας is construed with an ὥς ὅτι + ind. declarative clause, which was a feature of low-level late Greek.² The use of οἶσθας is likely to have been determined by the same ambition for literary respectability as that responsible for the rhetorical arrangement at l. 9. But is this ambition a function of the rank of the recipient, or was the writer inclined to sprinkle his everyday prose with poetic loans for aesthetic reasons?

2.2.4. Of a single individual we can reconstruct the normal attitude to poeticisms, and we can place his linguistic usage in the context of his cultural interests. This man is Dioscorus of Aphroditō, a lawyer active in the sixth century (c. AD 520 - after 585). Dioscorus owned copies of classical Greek literary works: codices of *Iliad*, of *Scholia minora* to *Iliad*, and of Old and New Comedy (the famous Cairo codex containing *inter alia* the *Epitrepontes* of Menander) have survived the caprice of history.³ He also composed a number of iambic and hexameter poems, autograph copies of which, mostly in draft form, have been unearthed together with his own documentary papers.⁴ His surviving petitions and contracts — indeed a respectable number of items — exhibit a pronounced inclination to welcome poetic features on many a different occasion and in varying proportions. This inclination is certainly related to his literary leanings and interests.

2.2.4.1. In some cases, Dioscorus adopted poetic lexemes into passages characterised by a concentration of several poetic ingredients. The prosaic re-use of poetic vocabulary appears, in these circumstances, to be part of a wider project to invest prose with pronounced poetic colour. In *Iliad* 16.156-163, Homer compared the Myrmidons to voracious wolves. Dioscorus took over the simile in an elaborate⁵ petition of AD 567 to the *dux* of the Thebaid (P.Cair.Masp. I 67002, III 15). The individuals whom he equates with wolves are the targets of his complaint, viz. the

¹ On the problem see § 2.1.4.

² Cf. Jannaris 1897 § 1754; Ljungvik 1926, 67-68; Tabachovitz 1926, 21-22; Mayser II 3, p. 45 n. 1; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 396; Turner, *Syntax* 137.

³ Cf. Clarysse 1983, 55-57; Gagos - van Minnen 1994, 20; Fournet 1997.

⁴ Editions: *GDRK* I² XLII, II S 10; MacCoull 1988, 57-146 (with brief commentary). Add P.Berol. inv. 21334v, ed. C.A. Kuehn, *ZPE* 97 (1993) 110-115. A new edition by J.-L. Fournet is forthcoming.

⁵ Cf. MacCoull 1988, 26-29.

pagarch Menas and the unruly shepherds of Phthia. In his adaptation of the Homeric model, Dioscorus incorporated verbal echoes of Homer, as follows:¹

Dioscorus	Il. 16
καὶ οὐκ ἡδέως ἔχομεν ἔτι ζῆσαι	
καὶ ὑποσχεῖν τὰς ἀθεμίτους	
το[σαύτας(?)] ἀδεῶς τόλμας	
καὶ πράξεις ὥς λύκων καὶ ἀρπάγων	155-156 λύκοι ὥς ὠμοφάγοι
ἀεὶ πραττόντων ὠμοφάγων τρόποις.	
τὸ γὰρ ἀνθρώπινον αἷμα ἐκχέουσιν	162 ἐρευγόμενοι φόνον αἵματος
οἱ τοιοῦτοι αὐθαδεῖς καὶ ἄτρομοι.	162-163 ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς στήθεσιν ἄτρομός ἐστι

'We are not pleased to live yet longer and bear fearlessly such lawless, daring acts as of rapacious wolves which always behave like carnivores. For human blood such stubborn, fearless men shed'.

Poetic loans such as ὠμοφάγος and ἄτρομος were thus taken over as markers of learned imitation. Dioscorus manipulated them to create his own personal poetic style. It may be noted that the whole passage which runs from καὶ πράξεις to ἄτρομοι is characterised by an uninterrupted iambic sequence. Two arguments suggest that the presence of this rhythm is not a matter of chance. Firstly, the iambically-scanning sequence seems too long to be casual. Secondly, certain of the units of utterance presuppose uncommon linguistic choices, which are likely to have been constrained by rhythm. Dioscorus, for instance, could have produced more fluid Greek by writing *ὥς λύκων ἀρπάγων καὶ ὠμοφάγων. This utterance would have involved an automatised linguistic act. The Homeric model itself offered a clear instance of the adjectival use of ὠμοφάγος.² There must have been a special reason behind the choice of an involved periphrasis (ὥς λύκων . . . ἀεὶ πραττόντων ὠμοφάγων τρόποις) and an awkward hendiadys (ὥς λύκων καὶ ἀρπάγων). The desire for a rhythmical flow seems an adequate motivation. The poetic rhythm seems in its turn to perform a function appropriate to context. It commences in the middle of a sentence, just before the simile. The absence of a full overlap between sense and rhythm is found elsewhere in Dioscorus' prose as well as in other writers,³ but in this case the device aims to highlight the poetic connotation of the passage imitating Homer as opposed to previous verbal sequences. Apparently the long iambic sequence cannot be subdivided into shorter units. Perhaps Dioscorus gave rhythm

¹ The verbal echoes were noticed by Zilliacus (1967, 70) and Fournet (1993, 228-229; 1997, 302).

² Cf. also ἄρπαγας λύκους in Lycophr. 1309 (on the reading ἄρπαγας see Eust. 337.15, I 527.11-13 van der Valk). It may be noted that Verg. Aen. 2.355 *lupi ceu | raptores*, which is based on the present Homeric model, was known as an exemplary case of simile (Quint. Inst. or. 8.3.72).

³ Dioscorus: § 2.2.4.2 nos. 1B, 2. Cf. also Dover 1997, 106.

priority over metrical structure. Why he preferred iambs to dactyls, however, it is hard to tell.

P.Cair.Masp. II 67151, a stylistically elaborate ¹ will of AD 570, opens with a gnomic preamble (ll. 17-20), which consists of two main units of thought (A and B) joined together by μὲν . . . δέ. Each unit is in its turn composed of two cola linked by καί. While A is subdivided into two main clauses, καί is used in B to connect two parts of one and the same clause. Entire sequences of this period were phrased so as to scan iambically. The structure of the whole period can be set out as follows:

1	πέρας μὲν πάντων καὶ βροτησίου γένους ὁ θάνατος	3 ia ²
2	καὶ τοῦτον ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν ἐκφυγεῖν παντελῶς,	3 ia ³
3	τοῖς δὲ καλῶς φρονοῦσι τοῦτο προμαθεῖν	3 ia ⁴
4	καὶ εὐλαβεῖσθαι πάντων εὐτυχέστερον.	3 ia

'The end of all things and of the human race is death, and it is totally impossible to escape; for those rightly disposed, to make advance provision for it and to take precautions is the most successful plan of all'.

NB. Metrical sequences, numbered serially on the left-hand side, have been printed in bold type. Sequences 2 and 4 have been indented to highlight the μὲν . . . δέ structure of the period.

Sequence 1 is an adaptation of Dem. 18.97 πέρας μὲν γὰρ ᾧπασιν ἀνθρώποις ἐστὶ τοῦ βίου θάνατος, which is cited by Ruf. *Ars rhet.* I 469.15-17 Spengel as an emblematic example of γνώμη.⁵ As the metrical re-shaping did not affect the saying in its entirety, it must have been the work of Dioscorus. He undoubtedly composed sequences 2-4 as well. The whole preamble takes the form of a short composition in iambic trimeters. This particular poetic rhythm is clearly a function of content, since iambic trimeter was the traditional metre of gnomic sentences. The adjective βροτήσιος, a strictly poetic word found especially in archaic and classical verse compositions (Hesiod, Alcman,

¹ Cf. MacCoull 1988, 50-54.

² Even in his iambic poems, Dioscorus occasionally employed spondees in the second and fourth feet, see Saija 1978, 843.

³ The same hypermetric period-end of the form √ - - √ - was used by Dioscorus in a trimeter poem, see *GDRK* I² XLII 12 A.12. Moreover, his iambic trimeters, in which resolutions are admitted freely, offer one case of tribrach in the fourth foot (in the present case, it occurs in the second foot) and 3 cases of anapaest in the third foot: cf. Saija 1978, 843. The sequence √ √ √ √ √ - occupying the second and third feet is found as early as Aristophanes (though with word-end after the tribrach), see West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 89.

⁴ It may be noted that even in his iambic compositions Dioscorus often treated short open syllables placed in *longum* positions as long, see Saija 1978, 841.

⁵ Cf. Zilliacus 1967, 66.

Pindar, and Euripides),¹ is another ingredient which contributes to the poetic character of performance. It may be noted that Euripides was regarded as a fecund source of moral sentences. Dioscorus might possibly have deemed βροτήσιος to be reminiscent of Euripides and therefore appropriate to an iambic gnomic composition.²

The exploitation of imagery is not confined to P.Cair.Masp. I 67002, but Dioscorus' real debt to poetry is not equally clear. In P.Cair.Masp. I 67089 r B, a draft of a petition or possibly 'a complimentary oration to a newly appointed Duke',³ the well-known metaphor of the Ship of State is used to greet the renovated prosperity which the Thebaid is experiencing under the rule of the new *dux* (ll. 1-2): the Thebaid — we are told — has found a helmsman (εὐτυχήσασα . . . κυβερνήτην), and (thereby ?) has reached the desired calm waters (τῆς εὐκταίας . . . ἐπιτυχοῦσα γαλήνης) after getting entangled in a storm (χειμῶνος). It has been suggested that the allegory is reminiscent of poetry, and that the lexemes κυβερνήτης, χειμῶν, and γαλήνη provide the passage with poetic colour.⁴ The whole passage, however, has no distinct point of contact with any known poetic occurrence of the metaphor. Moreover, neither the allegory as such nor the specific vocabulary adopted are necessarily markers of poetic pretension. The Ship of State metaphor is a commonplace in ancient literature.⁵ Very common in poetry,⁶ it was also exploited by prose writers, both classical and post-classical. We can distinguish two images:

i. the ship/State needs a pilot/guide to sail/to be ruled safely;

ii. the ship/State may undergo storms/conflicts or calm weather/peaceful periods.

Dioscorus juxtaposed the two images, (ii) perhaps being an expansion of (i). The new helmsman/governor seems to represent the logical *trait d'union*; his appointment was probably viewed as an act which enabled the ship/State to overcome the perils of bad weather/war. Image (i) is found in poetry,⁷ and Dioscorus himself borrowed it in an iambic encomium (GDRK I² XLII 9.18). Yet it was also employed by philosophers and

¹ Cf. LSJ s.v.; Zilliacus 1967, 78.

² For similar motivations behind the prosaic re-use of poetic language in Attic see Dover 1997, 108-109.

³ So H.I. Bell, *JHS* 64 (1944) 27.

⁴ Cf. Zilliacus 1967, 70.

⁵ Cf. J. Kohlmeyer, *Seesturm und Schiffbruch als Bild im antiken Schrifttum* (Diss. Greisswald 1934); W. Gerlach, 'Staat und Staatschiff', *Gymnasium* 2 (1937) 127-139.

⁶ Cf. *Schol.* Aristoph. *Vesp.* 29 (p. 13 Koster) ἀεὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ τὰς πόλεις τοῖς πλοίοις παραβάλλουσιν.

⁷ Cf. Theogn. 674-676; Pind. *Pyth.* 1.86; 4.274; Aesch. *Sept.* 2-3, 62-64.

historians, even in extended forms.¹ (ii) seems predominant in poetry, see Alcae. (esp.) 6, 73, 208a Voigt; Theogn. 671-680; Soph. *Ant.* 162-163. The occurrence in Cassius Dio 52.16.3-4 is interesting because of its points of similarity with Dioscorus' treatment of the metaphor,² but there is no reason to think that it was known to him. It is thus unclear whether Dioscorus recognised the whole allegory as poetic or generically literary, or perhaps whether he expanded a literary commonplace into a more distinct poetic metaphor. The passage exhibits no word which is specifically reminiscent of a known poetic attestation of the metaphor. The vocabulary used provides inconclusive evidence as to Dioscorus' chosen stylistic connotation. Doubts, for instance, arise over the poetic status of the lexeme κυβερνήτης. Although ναύκληρος represented the standard term for 'helmsman', κυβερνήτης does occur in prose, even in certain of the passages where the metaphor is found (Aristotle, Polybius, Cassius Dio, Basil of Caesarea, Theodoret). It may have been perceived as a high level variant without a specific poetic connotation. Similar considerations apply to χειμών and γαλήνη. In view of their occurrences in Homer and in classical poetry in general, both lexemes are appropriate to prosaic passages aiming at poetic colour. Yet neither seems to convey a specifically poetic resonance. χειμών 'storm' was common in post-classical prose, and γαλήνη seems to have been a technical term for 'calm (on the sea)' in Koine.³

2.2.4.2 Dioscorus also incorporated poetic loans into 'neutral' contexts, that is to say, into passages which had no specific poetic character. Indeed, I am far less confident than others of the poetic status of many of the nouns and adjectives found in such contexts,⁴ but numerous examples seem virtually certain. I shall select some

¹ Cf. Plat. *Resp.* 6. 488 a-e; *Leg.* 6. 758 a; Aristot. *Pol.* 3.2.1.1276 b; Polyb. 6.44, Dio Cass. 52.16.3-4. For the use of the metaphor in other contexts see *LXX Macc.* 4.7.1-3; Theodor. Cyr. *De prov.* 2 & 7 (PG 83. 576 A-B & 676 B-D); Basil. Caes. *Or. ad adol.* 8.3. On the varying amplitude of metaphors and its stylistic significance see Dover 1997, 127-129.

² The sense is as follows: without a helmsman, the ship/State is tossed in a stormy sea over many generations (ἐν κλύδωνι πολλῷ φερομένη σαλεύει); a leader provides the way out.

³ Note its occurrences in Epictetus and the NT: materials in Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v.

⁴ Three select instances. That ἀποβολιμαῖος 'outcast' (P.Cair.Masp. III 67353v A 8,17; P.Cair.Masp. I 67097v. D 49,52,77) did not convey any specifically poetic resonance (*pace* Zilliaccus 1967, 76) is suggested by *CGL* II 235.56 (*reiecticius*) (Aristoph. *Pax* 678 is not relevant). The adjective ἄσπλαγχνος in the sense 'heartless' (P.Cair.Masp. I 67002 I 13; P.Cair.Masp. III 67353v A 11) was standard late Greek, as is shown by (i) *CGL* II 248.23 (*immisericors*), (ii) the many occurrences of ἄσπλαγχνία 'heartlessness' (Lampe s.v.); Soph. *Ai.* 472 proves nothing (*pace* Zilliaccus 1967, 77). The doubts raised by Zilliaccus himself (1967, 82) over the poetic status of the two adjectives are well-grounded. In P.Cair.Masp. I 67007r, I doubt that the phrase τοὺς ταύτης οἰκήτορας πρηνεῖς πλετω'κότ[ας] 'inhabitants fallen with the face downwards' (l. 6) is an adaptation of such *Iliad* phrases as 11.179 πρηνεῖς . . . ἔκπεσον, 12.395-396, 17.300 *al.* (so Fournet 1997, 302). πρηνὴς πίπτειν was the normal

exemplary cases.

1. In SB XIV 11856, possibly a petition to a *comes* (Dorotheus ?), Dioscorus incorporated:¹

(A) a quotation from *Il.* 1.249 (l. 7);

(B) a portion of an unknown iambic verse (*TrGF* II F 718) into the syntactical and conceptual texture of a sentence (l. 8);

(C) the Homeric *iunctura* νήπια τέκνα 'little children' (l. 16), just as he did in another petition (no. 5) and in a hexameter poem (P.Cair.Masp. II 67184v.6 = MacCoull 1988, 123-124);

(D) the rare epic adjective ἀζηχῆς (l. 15) in the sense 'unremitting in' (ἀλγηδόνας 'distress'), which seems to have been inspired by *Il.* 15.25 ἀζηχῆς ὀδύνη 'unceasing distress'.²

2. In another petition, P.Flor. III 295 (before AD 551 ?³), Dioscorus inserted into the syntactical and conceptual texture of a sentence (l. 6) the same re-elaborated version of a gnomic trimeter ascribed to Euripides (fr. 512 Nauck²) as that employed later in a trimeter encomium of AD 566/567 (*GDRK* I² XLII 10.25).⁴

3. P.Cair.Masp. I 67006r.6, a sixth-century petition to the *dux* of the Thebaid written on behalf of an inhabitant of Sabbis in the Theodosiopolite nome, exhibits an occurrence of the rare adjective ἀλίστοτος in the sense 'inflexible' (*WB* I 55.56). Strictly poetic, the word is peculiar to hexameter verse:⁵ apart from three occurrences in Euripides, it is found in *Iliad*, Hesiod, Apollonius Rhodius, Nicander, Quintus of Smyrna, Oppian, Musaeus. The meaning is derived from Homer.⁶

4. P.Cair.Masp. I 67020 has another occurrence of ἀζηχῆς (l. 4, see Fournet 1993, 226; cf. no. 1D) in the same sense as *Il.* 15.25, and also a poetic pun on the

expression for 'fall headlong' even in Koine (cf. e.g. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. πρηνής). The uncommon feature lies in the metaphorical sense of the expression, but this usage was not influenced by Homer.

¹ Cf. H. Machler *ap. ed.pr. & ap. TrGF* II appar. to 718; Fournet 1993, 226-228. On the nature, authorship, and recipient of the papyrus see Fournet 1993, 224, 228, 229-230, respectively.

² Eust. 1125.42 (IV 115.14 van der Valk) regarded the word as a ποιητική λέξις. For the sense 'unceasing' in ancient etymological notes and lexical glosses on the word see *Lfgre* 184.16-28, 37-46.

³ Cf. MacCoull 1988, 79 n. 45.

⁴ Cf. W. Crönert, *Gnomon* 2 (1926) 660; MacCoull 1988, 79 with n. 46; Fournet 1993, 229.

⁵ Cf. Zilliacus 1967, 75.

⁶ For ancient glosses see *Lfgre* 483.71-75 s.v.

patronymic of the recipient (l. 6), just as in the iambic encomium *GDRK I² XLII 17.5*.¹

5. P.Cair.Masp. I 67004 exhibits further occurrences of ὠμοφάγος (ll. 10, 14; cf. § 2.2.4.1) and the Homeric *iunctura* νήπια τέκνα (l. 14; cf. no. 1C). Other important poetic loans include σέβας 'awe' (l. 8) and λώτισμα 'flower' (l. 16). The former occurs frequently in verse (not in prose), whereas the latter is an exceedingly rare poetic lexeme: it is attested for Aesch. fr. 99.17 Radt (from *Cares* ?) and Eur. *Hel.* 1583 (LSJ *s.v.*; Zilliacus 1967, 80), where however the sense is metaphorical ('the flower of', 'the best of').

6. In P.Cair.Masp. III 67314, a contract of inheritance of AD 570, Dioscorus employed the epic form οὖνομα instead of ὄνομα (fr. 3.8).²

7. P.Cair.Masp. III 67313, a division of an inheritance of an unknown year after AD 566, exhibits the Homeric adjective αὐτοκασίγνητος (l. 65).³

2.2.5. It may be noted that by far the large majority of poetic loans are found in sources composed by or on behalf of citizens and addressed either to other common people (letters, contracts) or to officials (petitions). Texts issued by official chanceries, including not only high-ranking local bureaus but also chanceries in charge of imperial constitutions, are generally free of poeticisms. There seems to have been little straining after effects in the language of bureaucracy. It is thus exceptional to find an uncommon metaphorical expression in a third-century papyrus which contains the proclamation of *rationalis Aegypti* and procurator, viz. P.Oxy. XXXIII 2664 (c. AD 245-248 or 248/249 [BL VIII 260]). Lines 6-8 have τοὺς . . . | . . . εἰκόνας ὥς εἰπεῖν τῶν τοιούτων ὑπηρεσιῶν παρασχομένους ('those who performed as it were phantoms of such services'). Note, however, the use of ὥς εἰπεῖν to soften the metaphor.⁴

¹ Cf. Maspero, *P.Cair.Masp.* I (1911) p. 46; Fournet 1993, 228.

² Cf. Fournet 1997, 302.

³ On this adjective see *LfgrE* 1623.77-1625.6 *s.v.*

⁴ For such devices as lenitives of the effects of metaphors see Demetr. *De eloc.* 80; Long. *Περὶ ὕψους* 32.3 (who defines them μελίσματα . . . τῶν θρασειῶν . . . μεταφορῶν 'softeners of bold metaphors'); Quint. *Inst. or.* 8.3.37. Cf. D.A. Russell, 'Longinus' *On the Sublime* (Oxford 1964) 152; C.M. Mazzucchi, *Dionisio Longino. Del sublime* (Milan 1992) 244-245; Dover 1997, 125. On their use in (classical) prose see most recently Dover 1997, 125-126.

2.3. SELF-SATISFACTION AND DIVERTISSEMENT

2.3.1. External factors are unlikely to have represented the only determinants of language cultivation. It is conceivable that self-satisfaction promoted de-automatised linguistic acts in contexts where subject, genre, and recipient appear to have exerted no direct influence on language selection. Dioscorus, for instance, may have been led by this psychological stimulus to borrow strictly poetic vocabulary and morphology in private contracts (cf. § 2.2.4.2 nos. 6,7). Probably his attitude was not solitary in the sixth century. Another occurrence of poetic morphology — the dative plural ending in -οῖσι — is found in P.Bad. VI 172.17 (χρηστηρίοισι),¹ a contract of lease of AD 547 from Oxyrhynchus. It may be noted (a) that the papyrus is an unpretentious document composed of standard formulae; (b) that the poetic ending occurs precisely in one of these formulae (σὺν χρηστηρίοισι καὶ δικάίοις πᾶσι); (c) that all the other leases from Byzantine Oxyrhynchus which exhibit the same formula have χρηστηρίοις, and not -οῖσι.² A mere scribal slip cannot be excluded in theory, but the Dioscorian parallel suggests that even the scribe of P.Bad. 172 may have adopted the dialect ending for the sake of self-satisfaction. We must remember that we are uninformed about his education, cultural interests (if any), and normal prose usage. It may also be noted that -οῖσι provides the formula with a fluid trochaic rhythm: is this a matter of chance?

2.3.2. There is evidence to show that self-satisfaction could take the form of real *divertissement*. I shall draw attention to two exemplary cases.

2.3.2.1. The first example occurs in a long roll written by Socrates son of Sarapion, a well-to-do inhabitant of Roman Karanis on whom papyri and archaeological data provide a great deal of information.³ He owned a very large house⁴ and probably also a handful of books: a grammatical text, a copy of Menander's *Epitrepontes*, and a copy of *Acta Alexandrinorum* were found in his house, whereas one other grammatical papyrus was unearthed in the street in front of it.⁵ As a collector of money taxes (πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν) in the year 171/72 — a post which enabled him to earn a

¹ Cf. Gignac II 23. The reading seems certain, see G.A. Gerhard, *P.Bad.* (1938) p. 13.

² P.Oxy. XVI 1889.17-18 (AD 496), P.Oxy. XVI 1959.13 (AD 499), SB XVI 12583.16 (= P.Oxy. XVI 1962.16, AD 500), PSI V 466.14-15 (AD 518). Cf. also P.Stras. V 471 bis, 10-11 = P.Flor. I 73 (AD 505, Herm.), P.Stras. IV 248.8 (AD 561, see *BL* V 140, VIII 416; Herm.); P.Oxy. VII 1038.25-26 = *Sel. Pap.* I 47 (AD 568); P.Hamb. I 23.20 (AD 569, Ant.; cf. Amelotti - Migliardi Zingale 1985 no. 21).

³ See S. Strassi Zaccaria, *ZPE* 85 (1991) 245-61 and van Minnen 1994, 237-51.

⁴ Cf. van Minnen 1994, 239.

⁵ Cf. van Minnen 1994, 243-244. The two grammatical papyri are still unpublished.

substantial amount of money¹ —, Socrates compiled P. Mich. IV 223, a huge tax-roll which records day-to-day payments of money taxes.² In this roll, Herbert Youtie brilliantly detected a case of re-use of a learned poetic word.³ The father of a certain Deios, a lessee who had to pay the taxes on behalf of his lessor, is registered with the Egyptian name Pampin at l. 2437 and elsewhere, but with a different name at l. 2665. Youtie read [᾽]Ανδίκτο(υ), and concluded that the lexeme ἀνδίκτης, a learned word occurring in literature only in the third book of Callimachus' *Aetia* (*SH* 259.33 = fr. 177 Pfeiffer), was employed to translate Pampin into Greek: ἀνδίκτης was interpreted in antiquity as 'mouse-trap' or 'tongue of the mouse-trap',⁴ and Pampin seems to mean 'The One of the Mice', or 'The Mousetrap' (it is a case of conversion of a trade noun into a personal name).

It is noteworthy that a document which contains purely administrative matters offers a case of translation of a native personal name with a term which was foreign to the Greek onomastic tradition. Moreover, it is extraordinary that this word was not borrowed from everyday Greek. Papyri from Roman Egypt document terms for 'mouse-catcher': cf. μιοθηρευτής in P. Oxy. II 299.2⁵ (late i AD, priv. lett.) and μιοθηρατής in P. Lond. I 125.44 p. 192 ff. (iv AD, private accounts of expenditure). Both lexemes could have been used to render 'The One of the Mice'. Even assuming Pampin to mean 'The Mousetrap' rather than 'The One of the Mice', the repertoire of Greek offered several other terms for 'mouse-trap' besides ἀνδίκτης. The lexeme παγίς was the standard Koine word for 'trap';⁶ the meaning 'mouse-trap' is explicitly documented by bilingual glossaries.⁷ Specific terms for 'mouse-trap' were also available:

(a) μυάγρα ('(tongue of the) mouse-trap'), attested in fifth-century Attic comedy (Aristoph. *Anagyr.* 55 K.-A. [*PCG* III 2, 58], *Phoen.* 576 K.-A. [*PCG* III 2, 296]), in later poetry (Tull. Sab. *AP* 9.410.1), and presumably in Koine (note the

¹ Cf. V.B. Schuman, *BASP* 12 (1975) 23-58 with the remarks of van Minnen 1994, 246.

² For the observation that P. Mich. 223 was penned by Socrates see van Minnen 1994, 244-245.

³ Cf. Youtie 1970, 549-551 = 1973, 1039-41.

⁴ 'Mousetrap': Et. Gen. B s.v. ἀνδίκτης (= Et. M. 102.10 Gaisf.). 'Tongue of the mousetrap': Hesych. α 4708 Latte.

⁵ = Olsson 1925 no.77 = *Sel. Pap.* I 108 = Hengstl 1978 no. 107 = *N. Pap. Prim.* no. 24.

⁶ See e.g. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich 607 s.v. Its widespread use in Koine seems to account for παγίδιον (Vett. Val.) and παγίδα (Byz. & Med., see Du Cange I 1076 s.v.). Cf. also παγίδευμα, attested in Aquila's translation of *LXX*, *Eccl.* 7.26(27) and in *Hom. Clem.* 41 A (derivatives in -μα were very popular in Koine, see e.g. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 109,2).

⁷ See *CGL* II 131.54, 391.47 (παγίς ἐπὶ μυῶν), III 457.14, 485.74.

Chapter Three

occurrences in bilingual glossaries,¹ in Pollux's *Onomasticon*,² and in the *interpretamenta* of some lexicographers³;

(b) μύαγρον, attested in CGL III 366.27 (*Hermeneumata Stephani*);

(c) μυοθήρας: the meaning 'mouse-trap' occurs in bilingual glossaries (CGL III 92.36).⁴

Socrates thus adopted the *most recherché* of all variants. This choice cannot have been determined by eagerness to make a display of erudition and to impress the reader, for no one would ever be likely to read such a gigantic administrative register and notice (let alone appreciate) the presence of a learned pun in the midst of a stream of arid, repetitious, and monotonous information.⁵ Socrates must have used ἀνδίκτης as a learned *flosculus* just for his own satisfaction. According to van Minnen (1994, 247), palaeography suggests that the daily entries in the tax-roll were recorded at the end of each day: 'the character of the hand differs considerably from day to day', Socrates being apparently 'susceptible to changes in mood'. Psychology thus seems to account not only for the graphological variations of Socrates' hand, but also for his outburst of enthusiasm for erudition. The day in which Pampin was translated as Ἀνδίκτης also represents a *terminus ante quem* for Socrates coming across the word.

Where Socrates found it, we cannot tell. The lexically correct re-use of such a learned *hapax* suggests that he used a source in which the reading ἀνδίκτης was equipped with a gloss. The range of possible sources available to him includes:

(a) an annotated copy of Callimachus' *Aetia*;

(b) a *hypomnema* to Callimachus;

(c) a glossary or a lexicographic work of some sort.

There is no argument in favour of or against any of these possibilities. Indeed, a papyrus fragment of *Aetia* was found in the house opposite that of Socrates.⁶ Did he

¹ CGL II 131.53, 373.40, 504.38, III 197.70, 259.41, 321.61, 366.48, 531.18.

² See 10.155 (citing Aristoph. *Phoen.* 576 K.-A. [*PCG* III 2, 296]) and 7.41.

³ Cf. Poll. 10.155 (on Aristoph. *Plut.* 815), 10.156 (on Callim. *SH* 259.33); Hesych. α 4708 Latte.

⁴ Elsewhere, μυοθήρας was used to denote a snake species (Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 9.6.612b, *Schol. Nic. Ther.* 490d Crugnola) in accord with the well-known eco-ethological criterion of herpetological nomenclature (cf. L. Bodson, 'Observations sur le vocabulaire de la zoologie antique: les noms de serpents en grec et latin', *Documents pour l'Histoire du Vocabulaire Scientifique* 8 [1986] 71).

⁵ Cf. Youtie 1970, 551 (= Youtie 1973, 1041).

⁶ It is P. Mich. inv. 4761c, ed. M. Gronewald, *ZPE* 15 (1974) 105-116 (Marcotte - Mertens 1990, 422 no. 217.2; pap. 10 Massimilla). For the precise findspot of the papyrus see van Minnen 1994, 243.

borrow that copy from his neighbour,¹ or was it rather his neighbour who borrowed the book from Socrates and then never returned it? We cannot really tell. In fact, nothing proves or even suggests that Socrates handled precisely that copy. Internal evidence is inconclusive.

The papyrus contains a portion of the Teuthis episode (fr. 110 Massimilla = *SH* 276 + fr. 667 Pfeiffer), which has been tentatively assigned to book 1.² If this hypothesis is correct, there are few possibilities that the same copy also contained book 3. There is no firm evidence in support of the suggested attribution of Teuthis to book 1, nor can we exclude the possibility that the episode belongs to the earlier part of book 3.³

In a source of (c)-type, a poetic lemma may or may not be supplemented with references to its original context, e.g. by citing the verse or verses, and/or the title of work, and/or the name of author where it occurs. Consequently, if Socrates used a source of this type, he may or may not have known the Callimachean origin of ἀνδίκτης.⁴ Although casting slender doubts about Socrates' real awareness of ἀνδίκτης as a poetic word, this does not invalidate the conclusion that he consciously used a word which did not belong to everyday Greek but looked unusual and recherché.

2.3.2.2. P. Kell. G. I 42, a loan contract of AD 364 excavated in ancient Kellis⁵ but probably drawn up at Aphrodito in the Nile valley,⁶ exhibits an occurrence of μελαγχαίτης ('black-haired') at l. 5. This is a very rare poetic adjective. It is used as an epithet in Hesiod (*Scut.* 186 [of the Centaur Mimas]), in choral odes of fifth-century Attic drama (*Soph. Trach.* 837 [of the Centaur Nessos]; *Eur. Alc.* 439 [of Hades]), and in late hexameter verse (*GDRK* fr. XLVIII 9;⁷ *Nonn. Dion.* 43.57 [of Helikaon]; *Christod. Ekphr.* [= *AP* 2] 63 [of Poseidon, the husband of Amydone]). As a name of Centaur (and not as an epithet), it also occurs in the lists of Centaurs found in Clitias'

¹ So van Minnen 1994, 245-246.

² A.S. Hollis, *CQ* n.s. 32 (76) (1982) 118-119; L. Lehnus, *ZPE* 91 (1992) 20.

³ Cf. G. Massimilla, *Aitia. Libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996) 441.

⁴ Two points merit attention. (i) The verse of *Aetia* 3 in which ἀνδίκτης occurs is cited by Poll. 10.156 (*olim* fr. 233 Schn.) and by Et.Gen. B s.v. ἀνδίκτης (= Et.M. 102.10 Gaisf.), but the authorship of the quotation is recorded by the former only. (ii) Hesychius' gloss on ἀνδίκτης (α 4708 Latte) is uninformative about the verse, work, and author where the lemma was found.

⁵ Modern Ismant el-Kharab, Dakhleh Oasis, in the Western desert, some 600 km south-southwest of Cairo.

⁶ See Worp 1995, 95 and 129. Both contract parties were born in Kellis but were living in Aphrodito at the time the contract was drawn up (see ll. 4, 7-8). As the papyrus was excavated in the debtor's own house in Kellis, Worp is correct in assuming that the contract was taken back to Kellis at some later point.

⁷ PSI VII 844 (iii AD). The name to which μελαγχαίτης refers is lost: Vitelli restored Hades.

Chapter Three

famous François Vase (Florence, Museo Archeologico 4209 ¹) ² and in Diod. Sic. 4.12.7, which evidently derive the name from a common mythographical tradition. A similar form, μελανοχαίτης, is cited by Theognost. *Can.* 478, ed. Cramer, *Anecd. Oxon.* II 85.11 (along with κυανοχαίτης).

In the Kellis contract, the lexeme μελαγχαίτης is used to describe the hair colour of the debtor (Aurelius Pamour), and occurs in conjunction with a word, κολοβός, which may represent either the nickname of Pamour or a continuation of his physical description. In papyrus documents, physical descriptions do include references to hair-style,³ but generally ignore the hair colour.⁴ In particular, I have found no explicit

-
- ¹ See *Materiali per servire alla storia del vaso François* (Bollettino d'Arte 62, Serie Spec. 1, Rome 1981). On its Centauromachy scenes cf. also A. Minto, *Il vaso François* (Acc. Tosc. di Sc. e Lett. 'La Colombaria'- Studi 6, Florence 1960) 59 ff. (p. 65 focuses on the scene depicting Melanchaïtes); J. Boardman, *Athenian Black Figure Vases. A Handbook* (London 1974) 33-34; K. Schefold, *Götter und Heldensagen der Griechen in der früh- und hocharchaischen Kunst* (Munich 1993) esp. 255-256.
- ² CIG IV 8185, re-edited most recently by M. Cristofani in *Materiali* (see previous n.) 177-178. Cristofani (177 no. 61) read Μελαν[- - -], which would allow Μελαν[χαιτες] (CIG 8185c, following a suggestion of E. Braun) or Μελαν[ιπος] (J. C. Hoppin, *A Handbook of Greek Black-Figured Vases* [Oxford 1924] 152). On the basis of the very good plate published in *Materiali* 185 no. 190, I read Μελαν[χαίτης] (so also Minto).
- ³ For the relevant vocabulary see Caldara 1924, 58 ff. For different views on the meanings of τετανός, κλαστός, υπόκλαστος see Hasebroeck 1921, 106-107.
- ⁴ See Caldara 1924, 56-57, 63, 94; Jax 1936, 158 (who relies on *WB*); no ex. is cited by Hasebroeck 1921. I have been unable to identify the five cases of 'coma rubea vel rutila' mentioned by F. Smolka, *Eos* 27 (1924) 76: scholars usually take πορρός and the like to denote complexion, see Caldara 1924, 56-57 (who explicitly rejects the possibility that they refer to hair colour); Jax 1936, 155. A scrutiny of documents published in the last six decades is needed. For a criticism of

mention of dark hair.¹ This is not to be wondered at. As ancient Egyptians were normally dark-haired,² black hair did not presumably represent a distinctive characteristic to be mentioned in documents.³ The occurrence in the Kellis papyrus is thus surprising. Additionally, physical descriptions of Roman papyri do not aim to produce artistic portraits. Poetic words were avoided.⁴ In fact Koine Greek offered a range of alternative adjectives for 'black-haired':

- (i) μελάνθριξ, attested in late Attic prose (Aristot. *Physiognom.* 808 a 19 [= *SPhGL* I 39.9-10]), in Pseudo-Polemon (*Adam. Physiognom. epit.* 64 = *SPhGL* I 417.12), in John Malalas' physical descriptions (8x, see E. & M. Jeffreys 1990, 237), and in the bilingual glossaries (*CGL* II 22.36 [glossing *atricapellus*], II 366.48);
- (ii) μελανόθριξ, attested in Hippocrates (*De aer. aq. et loc.* 24.12 [= *SPhGL* II 244.29], *Epid.* 1.2.9.26; 6.7.1.30), Aristotle (*De gen. anim.* 5.6. 786 a 25, though referred to animals), in Greek prose of the Roman period (Adamant. *Physiognom.* 2.31 [= *SPhGL* I 383.7]; Galen. *Ars Med.* 8, I 326.13; 16, I 344. 8 Kühn; *Quod animi mor. corp. temp. sequ.* 8, IV 801.2 Kühn; *Comm. in Hipp. libr. I Epid.* XVII (1) 184.9 and 185.17 Kühn [depending upon Hippocrates' own words]), and in later Byzantine prose (Georg. Cedr. *Hist. Comp.* I 531.22 Bekker). It was also used as a gloss on poetic terms such as κυανοχαίτης and ἰοπλόκαμος.⁵

They seem to represent two variant spellings of one and the same word,⁶ which was used for over ten centuries and in a wide range of contexts. It may be noted that (i) and (ii) were employed:

C. Gini's ungrounded belief that terms usually thought to denote complexion (including adjectives such as μελανόχρους) should in fact be referred to hair colour (*La pigmentazione degli abitanti dell' Egitto nell'età greco-romana* [Rome 1932]; cf. *Atti del Congresso Internazionale per gli studi sulla popolazione*, I [Rome 1933] 429-438), see Jax 1936, 155 ff. On the legal aspects of physical descriptions in papyri see G. Hübsch, *Die Personalangaben als Identifizierungsvermerke im Recht der gräko-ägyptischen Papyri* (Berl. Jur. Abh. 20, Berlin 1968).

- ¹ In P. Amh. II 62.6-7 (Socn., ii BC) μέλας and λευκός are nicknames, and are likely to denote complexion: cf. Hasebroek 1921, 108; Jax 1936, 154-155.
- ² This is suggested by common sense and is confirmed by ancient portraits from Roman Egypt: cf. e.g. E. Doxiadis, *The Mysterious Fayum Portraits* (London 1995).
- ³ See Jax 1936, 160.
- ⁴ See Jax 1936, 153, 161-162.
- ⁵ κυανοχαίτης: Herodian. *Partit.* 166 Boisson., *Schol.* D II. 14.390, *Schol.* Opp. Hal. 1.389, Hesych. κ 4351 Latte, *Sud.* κ 2581 Adler; ἰοπλόκαμος: Hesych. ι 750 Latte.
- ⁶ Cf. Schwyzer I 446 n. 6, 458. In Koine, the choice between μελάνθριξ and μελανόθριξ seems to have depended on individual taste. Another case of co-existence of both μελαν- and μελανο- forms in Koine Greek is μελάγχρους and μελανόχρους.

Chapter Three

(A) by prose writers

(1) in physiognomic contexts,

and (2) in physical descriptions not only of populations (Galen. *Quod animi mor. corp. temp. sequ.* 8, IV 801.2 Kühn) but also of well-known historical and mythical characters (Malalas, Cedrenos);

(B) by compilers of bilingual glossaries;

(C) by lexicographers to gloss higher level synonyms.

B and C testify to the suitability of μελάνθριξ/μελανόθριξ for lower styles. Item A further documents their regular use in prose at least until the tenth century AD. Apparently they were employed whenever writers chose to convey the idea of black hair with a compound adjective. No other compound seems to have enjoyed the same degree of popularity. The vitality of their usage in late Greek is well documented by Malalas and Cedrenos.¹ In the light of these facts, it is extraordinary that in the Kellis contract a poetic word was preferred to synonyms common in contemporary standard Greek.

I believe that the revival of μελαγχραίτης did not merely aim at describing a physical trait, but hides a learned allusion. Which exactly, we can only guess at. The term κολοβός (l. 5), be it a nickname or a descriptive term,² may indicate that Aur. Pamour was a mutilated man; perhaps he was a cripple.³ By contrast, swiftness and

¹ The style and language of physical descriptions in early Byzantine chronicles are remarkably stable, and compound adjectives are favoured: cf. Baldwin 1981, 10, E. & M. Jeffreys 1990, 232 ff. (on Malalas). For important methodological considerations on how to handle Byzantine physical descriptions see Baldwin 1981, 8-11. Cf. also C. Head, *Byzantion* 50 (1980) 226-240 (with the remarks of Baldwin 1981, esp. 11-21); P. Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley 1983) 12-16.

² κολοβός as a nickname: P.Oxy. I 43 v col. v 6 (AD 295); P. Oxy. XLVI 3314. 23 = *New Docs.* III no. 100 (iv AD). In two further cases (P.Wash. Univ. II 87 r 17, 21 [v or vi AD]; P.Oxy. XVI 2045 [AD 612]), it is uncertain whether κολοβός is to be taken as a personal name or a nickname. The term has not yet surfaced in a real physical description.

³ The exact meaning of κολοβός is uncertain. As a descriptive term of person, it could denote any kind of mutilation, whether real (e.g., lameness, circumcision) or metaphorical (shortness in height, stubbiness etc.). In the absence of further specifications, it is hard to tell what precisely it denotes. Scholars have translated κολοβός as 'cripple' (J. Rea, *P. Oxy.* XLVI [1978] p. 104; G. Tibiletti in E. Bresciani *et al.* [edd.], *Scritti in onore di Orsolina Montevicchi* [Bologna 1981] 410; G.H.R. Horsley, *New Docs.* III 142), 'stubby' (K. Maresch-Z.M. Packman, *P.Wash.* II [1990] 123), 'short, undersized' (J. Rea, *The P.Oxy.* XLVI [1978] 105). In this case, Worp 1995, 127 translated 'short, undersized', but emphasised that other translations are possible.

stoutness were regarded as distinctive characteristics of the Centaurs,¹ to whom the word μελαγχαίτης was particularly allusive. They were certainly well-known to educated individuals who were acquainted with classical literature,² or with *hypomnemata*, or perhaps with mythographic texts. I tentatively suggest that the writer aimed at caricaturing Pamour's physical defects by assimilating him to a swift Centaur.

The contract was issued under the name of Pamour himself. As he was illiterate, a certain Aur. Pebos subscribed for him (ll. 37-39), whereas the main body of the document was penned by a professional clerk, presumably from Aphrodito. The latter is also likely to have phrased the text and to have chosen μελαγχαίτης. The contract was *expected* to be held only by the creditor (Aurelia Sophia).³ Thus, either the scribe made the putative parody of Pamour for the sake of personal satisfaction, or he believed Sophia to be capable of catching the point of the joke. Certainly he knew that Pamour would not understand it. However, we cannot expect to explain everything. Even if my suggested reconstruction of the whole story were correct, there would still be no way to divine the source from which the scribe derived his knowledge of a μελαγχαίτης Centaur. There would be several possibilities: a copy of Hesiod's *Shield* is just one of them.⁴

-
- ¹ See Hom. *Il.* 1. 267; Soph. *Trach.* 1095-1096; Isocr. *Hel. enc.* 26; Sch. Pind. *Pyth.* 9.65 (II 226.7-8 Drachm.); Schol. Soph. *Trach.* 1096 (341.6 Papag.). Note also Tzetz. *Comm. in Aristoph. Ran.* 38 (716.8 Koster) Κενταυρικῶς] ἰσχυρῶς (the *scholia vetera ad loc.* [275.77 ff. Dübner] interpret the adverb as ἀκόσμως or μαλακῶς). Centaurs derived these characteristics from their equine half, see Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, II 1 (Leipzig 1890-1894) 1067.10 ff.
- ² Papyri give an idea about the circulation of classical literature in Egypt. *Iliad* I: Pack² 552-622; C. Lestani, *Rudiae* 4 (1992) 140-144. Sophocles' *Trachinians*: H. Lloyd-Jones - N.G. Wilson, *Sophoclis fabulae* (OCT, 1990) xix (3 items). Isocrates' *Helena*: J. Lenaerts - P. Mertens, *CE* 64 (1989) 228 (3 items).
- ³ See ll. 25-27 τὸ δὲ χειρόγραφον τοῦτο ἅπλουν ('written in one copy') σοι (*scil.* to the creditor, Aurelia Sophia) ἐξεδόμην (*scil.* the debtor, Aur. Pamour). Yet, as the document was found in the debtor's own house, it probably never reached the creditor's hands.
- ⁴ This work circulated in Graeco-Roman Egypt, see Pack² 499, 504-507, P.Oxy. XLV 3221, 3232.

CHAPTER FOUR

HIGH LEVEL PROSE STYLE IN PRIVATE LETTERS FROM ROMAN AND EARLY BYZANTINE EGYPT

1. STRATEGIES OF STYLISTIC REFINEMENT

1.0. Let us put ourselves in the position of *an* educated Greek who wanted to write *a* piece of non-literary prose, for instance a letter or a petition. If he wished, he could aim to distance his composition from casual performance by refining its stylistic form. The range of resources available to him for carrying out his intentions was very wide. For instance, he was free to utilise:

- (A) rhetorical preambles and philosophical digressions;
- (B) well-rounded periods, in various degrees of amplitude and complexity;
- (C) artificial orderings of clauses;
- (D) artificial orderings of words within the clause;
- (E) rhythm, in various degrees of thoroughness;
- (F) metaphors and similes, in various degrees of extension;
- (G) rhetorical figures;
- (H) syntactical constructions characteristic of higher level prose;
- (I) puristic variants;
- (J) elements of poetic language;
- (K) choice lexemes characteristic of refined literary prose;
- (L) metaphorical senses of individual words.

He could use one or more of these ingredients. If he decided for the latter option, he could either confine his chosen high-level features to a particular context or could spread them throughout the composition. If he opted for the latter, he could either avoid or create concentrations of different ingredients. These typologies of premeditated language behaviour produce varying degrees of stylistic refinement. In other words, the stylistic level of a non-literary text depends mainly on the degree of consistency to which high level features such as A-L were integrated into it, as well as on their degree of reciprocal interaction. Writers could thus rely on countless modes of refinement. The numerous possibilities offered by purism and by poetic language, which I illustrated in Chapter III, represent only a small fraction of the many available. In the following paragraphs, I shall not offer separate treatment of other ingredients, but shall attempt to investigate precisely how the resources of literary Greek, including A-L above, interact in ambitious non-literary prose. My principal aim will be to identify strategies of stylistic refinement as well as the factors which influenced conduct and performance. For convenience, I shall focus on a selection of private letters dating from the early second to fourth centuries. In order to facilitate the appreciation of their stylistic distance from casual prose, I shall include in Appendix (B) references to or full

Chapter Four

discussions of the language and style of select private letters which can be classified within the middle and low registers. In the final part of this chapter, the various strategies of stylistic planning will be placed within the context of Greek epistolary theory so as to examine to what extent they conform to the accepted norms of good usage (§ 2).

1.1. SPECIAL CONTEXTS

1.1.1. In some private letters, the level of linguistic and stylistic refinement was deliberately raised on particular occasions. P.Oxy. VII 1070 (late iii AD)¹ provides a very interesting example. The writer undertook moderately puristic self-censorship (Ch. III § 1.3.3 III C), but refrained from keeping to an equally high level of stylistic care throughout the letter. Except for occasional literary touches (e.g. 50 μὴ ἄρα ποτε θέλης), the second part of the letter (ll. 26-56) seems fairly ordinary in terms of content and style. In contrast, the first part (ll. 2-26) exhibits much greater stylistic care. Particular concentrations of high-level literary items occur on two occasions. The letter opens with a long and elaborate invocation to Sarapis (ll. 2-12), in which rhythm seems to have been sought both at the beginning and at the end of each period, thus:

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------------|
| | (A) ἡ προάγουσα παρ' ἐμοῦ παρὰ πᾶσι θεοῖς εὐχή | † dactylic rhythm ² |
| 1 { | (B) Σαραπίῳ προσκυνεῖ | * sp + cr |
| | (A) τὸν μέγαν θεὸν Σαρᾶπιν παρακαλῶ | † 2 tr + ~ cr |
| 2 { | (B) ἀνθρώποισι νενομισμένων | * cr ~ + cr |

NB. The cross (†) indicates prolonged rhythmic sequences, the asterisk (*) simple *clausulae*.

The beginnings of periods seem to have been considered worthy of thorough poetic rhythm (1A, 2A), whereas shorter *clausulae* were preferred at the end (1B, 2B). Rhythm is associated with elements of artificial language. Sequence 1A, for instance, exhibits: (a) the alliteration of initial π; (b) the phrase προάγουσα παρ' ἐμοῦ where casual performance would have used μου after εὐχή; (c) the complex structure ἡ . . . εὐχὴ ἡ περί . . . τῆς σωτηρίας σου κτλ., which provides the utterance with a high-flown style. (In such cases, normal unsophisticated prose would not have repeated the article after the substantive.)³ Sequence 2B exhibits a remarkable poetic loan (cf. Ch. III § 2.2.2). The writer also appears to have made an attempt to improve the style of the passage at a later stage: the particle τε was added above 1. 3 with a view to introducing a τε . . . καί structure (cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 6): the same structure περί τε gen. καί gen. could be paralleled from Isocr. *Paneg.* 3, 28, *Philipp.* 2, *Panath.* 18, 25, 152.

¹ Tibiletti 1979 no. 16.

² This is in fact a catalectic hexameter characterised by an extra syllable in the *biceps* of the second foot.

³ In the *NT*, for instance, the article is normally omitted before postposed prepositional attributives, although it was often restored by individual MSS: cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 272.

Chapter Four

Another concentration of high level items is found at ll. 22-26. Quantitative *clausulae* occur at the end of cola, thus:

παντὸς προνόησον - - - - ^ (dactylic *clausula*),

αὐτῶν φειδομένη - - - - - (sp + chor).

The whole period is characterised by linguistic choices alien to casual prose. Note:

- A. the cumulation of synonyms (ἐπιμελείας καὶ φροντίδος);
- B. the use of the conjunctive participle (προνόησον . . . φειδομένη) where casual prose would use a finite verb (*προνόησον . . . καὶ φείδου);
- C. the artificial clause order in μηδενὸς ὧν ἔχομεν αὐτῶν φειδομένη — the incorporation of the relative clause between the antecedents presumably stems from a desire to place αὐτῶν φειδομένη at the end of the period and so to obtain a *clausula*.

In the previous example, high-flown style seems to have been chosen to enhance the solemnity of the invocation. The ambition for refined composition is thus a function of subject. On the other hand, no such explanation applies to this case, in which there is no obvious relationship between content and form. Perhaps the writer simply inclined to elevate the style. The same motivation might also account for the stylistic improvement at ll. 15-16, where the co-ordinating particle δέ was deleted and replaced with οὐχ ἦττον δὲ καί at the head of the clause (Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 6). The alteration aims to link the two clauses more tightly and to provide the passage with a literary touch.¹ It also produces a balanced chiasmus within the period.

¹ For οὐχ ἦττον δὲ καί linking two sentences (with or without preceding μέν) cf. Philo, *In Flacc.* 76 (with μέν); Ios. *Contra Ap.* 1.247 (without the main verb in the first sentence by scribal omission or anacoluthon); Dio Chrys. *Or.* 32.58.1 is slightly different (οὐχ ἦττον δὲ καί is used as a real particle at the head of a clause). Elsewhere it connects two elements within one and the same sentence, cf. Polyb. 3.35.6 (with μέν); 3.87.1; 9.24.8 (with μέν); 14.1.2 (with μέν) (cf. Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexicon*, I [1956] 1130 s.v. ἦττων 2); Ios. *Ant. Iud.* 16.260 (καί only is given by some MSS); Plut. *De virt. mor.* 6 (445 E); Orig. *Contra Cels.* 3.45, p. 240.20 Koetschau, GCS (= *Philoc.* 18.16.3, ed. J.A. Robinson); [Alex. Aphrod.] *De febr.* 16.1, ed. Ideler, *Physici et medici Graeci minores* I p. 92.16-17 (with μέν καί). Cf. also the very similar usage of οὐχ ἦττον δέ at Plut. *Cam.* 2.7; *Marcell.* 2.5; *Alex.* 53.1.

1.2. GENERALISED REFINEMENT: AMBITION AND FAILURE

1.2.0. Unlike P.Oxy. 1070, several private letters betray a thorough ambition for refined performance, but the writers did not succeed in gaining their purpose in all of them. A number of letters occur which consist of an inextricable combination of ingredients belonging to both the higher and the lower stylistic registers. The writers' ability to handle the resources of high level style is often modest.

1.2.1. A most interesting example is P.Mil.Vogl. I 24 (re-edited by Foraboschi 1968, 43-45) (AD 117), a familiar letter unearthed from the famous 'Cantina dei Papiri' at Tebtynis (Fayum) along with papers belonging to three different families and a number of literary papyri.¹ It has been argued that the letter was penned by Geminus, a member of one of those families whose published papers include two or possibly three unpretentious letters.² This proposed identification, however, cannot be regarded as certain;³ for convenience, I shall call the author 'Geminus'. Almost every period in the letter exhibits a conflation of higher level variants with items characteristic of lower strata. I here illustrate the most notable cases.

A. πρὸ πάντων εὐχομαί σε ἐρρῶσθαι καὶ [εὐ]τυχεῖν ὅπερ ἐμοὶ δι' εὐχῆς ἐστὶν τό σεν | ἐρρῶσθαι ὡς ἐμὸν σεμνὸν κύριον καὶ ἀδελφόν (ll. 3-6).

'First of all, I pray that you are well and prosperous, which I wish, (that is,) the fact that you, as my reverend lord and brother, are well'.

This is the very beginning of the letter, which consists of an expanded version of a typical early second-century *formula valetudinis* (type πρὸ μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ εὐτυχεῖν, ὃ μοι εὐκταῖόν ἐστι ⁴). The usual formula appears to have been stylistically remodelled. The periphrasis ἐμοὶ δι' εὐχῆς ἐστὶν is a higher level variant than ἐμοὶ εὐκταῖόν / εὐκτόν ἐστι: it was used by prose writers slightly earlier than or contemporary with the present letter, see Phil. *De fug. et inv.* 154 (μὴ γὰρ οὐ δι' εὐχῆς ἐστὶ μοι τὴν διάνοιαν ἀστείαν . . . ὡς ἀληθῶς εἶναι), Ios. *Ant. Iud.* 4.120 (ἦν τέ μοι δι' εὐχῆς μηδὲν ἀδικῆσαι); cf. Vit. 292 ed. Pell. (ἅπερ [R : ὅπερ cett.] ἔχει δι' εὐχῆς). The use of ὅπερ instead of simple ὃ contributes a literary touch: in general, ὅπερ is uncommon

¹ Cf. Gallazzi 1990, 287.

² Cf. Foraboschi 1968, 47-48. On Geminus, his letters, and the language used therein see App. (B) § 1.5. For more information on his family see App. (B) § 1.4.

³ As Foraboschi admitted, the script of P.Mil.Vogl. 24 is not exactly identical with that of Geminus' published letters, and the identification of Paul (the recipient of P.Mil.Vogl. 24) with Paulinus (the brother of Geminus) remains hypothetical.

⁴ Cf. P.Mich. VIII 476.3-5, 477.2-5, 478.3-6, 479.3-4, 480.3-5, all of which were composed by Cl. Terentianus in the early second century (see App. (B) § 1.2). Cf. Koskeniemi 1956, 129-130.

in Roman papyri.¹ On the other hand, the additional clause exhibits very different characteristics. The style is involved: the articular infinitive seems an unnecessary repetition of the preceding acc. + inf. clause (σε ἔρρωσθαι) and is syntactically ill-combined with the relative clause. More fluent Greek could have been obtained by incorporating the sequence ὥς — ἀδελφόν into that clause. Moreover, σεν = σε is a colloquial form anticipating MGr (ἐ)σένα, (ἐ)σέναν, (ἐ)σένανε.² It is clearly an inadvertent lapse from 'correct' Greek, since elsewhere in this letter the writer regularly adopted σε (ll. 3, 9, 27, 33, 63) and σου (ll. 11 [2x], 44, 61). It may be noted that Geminus used ἔσοῦ in an unpretentious autograph letter (P.Mil.Vogl. VI 281).³ The orthography of the whole period is unsatisfactory: a very common verb such as ἔρρωσθαι is consistently misspelled (ll. 3,5; cf. 60 ἔρρωσσο).⁴

B. νή τήν σήν μοι σωτηρίαν καὶ ἰ τήν τοῦ τεκνίου μου καὶ ὀρθοποδίαν, ἥς ἰ πέπεισμαί σε κήδεσθαι οὐκ ἔλλασσόν μου, ἰ ἥθελον μηθὲν πράσσειν ἄλλο εἰ μὴ τήν ἰ ὅψιν σου πρὸς τὰ ἐδάφη σου προσκυνεῖν, ἰ ἀλλ' οὐ δεδύνημαι οὐδὲ δύναμαι (ll. 7-12).

'(I swear) by your safety and by that of my little daughter,⁵ and by her skill in the two-footed gait, for which I believe you care no less than I do, I should have liked to do nothing else but do reverence to your aspect on your lands; but I was and am unable'.

This is a high-flown period, apparently characterised by homogeneous quantitative *clausulae*, thus:

μοι σωτηρίαν	sp + cr
καὶ ὀρθοποδίαν	sp + ~cr (= paeon IV)
οὐκ ἔλλασσόν μου	sp + molossus (or perhaps scanned as cr ?)
-φη σου προσκυνεῖν	sp + cr
-μαι οὐδὲ δύναμαι	sp + ~cr (= paeon IV)

The long and elaborate asseveration lends solemnity to the passage. To swear by the safety of the interlocutor must have been a widespread habit in Graeco-Roman antiquity, particularly in Egypt.⁶ A simple version of such adjurations is found in P.

¹ The situation is comparable in the *NT*, where ὅσπερ is very rare, see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 64,3; Radermacher 1925, 77-78; Turner, *Syntax* 48; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ὅς I 10 e. On Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser II 1, p. 77.

² Cf. Gignac II 164-165.

³ See App. (B) § 1.5 C no. 2.

⁴ For such misspellings see Gignac I 159.

⁵ Following a suggestion of Foraboschi 1968, 49, I assume that this τεκνίον is the same person as Politta *alias* Sarapias, who is mentioned at l. 65.

⁶ Cf. L. Eisner, *P.Iand.* II (1913) p. 67; Ghedini 1923, 233-234; Döllstädt 1934, 66;

Giss. I 19.11-12 (ii AD), in SB XVIII 13946.3 = Chapa 1998 no. 8 (iii/iv AD) — both have $\nu\eta$ τὴν σὴν σωτηρίαν —, and also in P.lond. II 22.4-5 (AD 619-629), though without $\nu\eta$. The degree of complexity could be elevated (1) by associating more people, particularly one's own children, with the interlocutor as ultimate targets of the adjuration; (2) by adding a second item by which the swearing was being performed; (3) by expanding the asseveration by means of a relative clause emphasising the writer's care for the thing(s) by which he was swearing. Apparently, only one or other of these three devices was usually employed, as is shown by the following Greek and Latin examples:

- (a) CEL I 222.13-14 ¹ (early iv AD) *iuro enim salutem communem et infantum nostrorum*: 1 only;
- (b) P.Oxy. VI 939.20 ² (iv AD) $\nu\eta$ γὰρ τὴν σὴν σωτηρίαν, κύριέ μου, ἥς μάλιστα μοι μέλει: 3 only;
- (c) Plin. ep. 83 (to Traian) *per aeternitatem tuam salutemque*: 2 only.

It may be noted that (a) and (b) are refined letters.³ 'Geminus' made the asseveration exceedingly elaborate by adopting all three devices. Moreover, unlike (c), his chosen additional item (ὀρθοδοξία) is unrelated to the notion of safety;⁴ and the relative clause following upon the $\nu\eta$ + acc. adjuration is more complex than (b). The idea conveyed is not 'I care for the thing by which I swear', but 'You as well as I care for the thing by which I swear'. Instead of simply associating himself with his interlocutor by means of a co-ordinating particle, 'Geminus' elevated the style by means of litotes (οὐκ ἔλασσον). In this context, it is unclear whether κήδεσθαι represents a loan from standard Greek or whether it was preferred to synonyms such as μέλειν and φροντίζειν because it was recognised as a higher level variant.

κήδεσθαι occurs e.g. in Aelius Aristides (Schmid II 123) and in a stylistically pretentious papyrus letter (P.Ryl. IV 624.16 = Moscadi 1970 no. 4; cf. § 1.3.4.2). But it is also found in unsophisticated private letters.⁵ These data are inconclusive as to

Koskenniemi 1956, 130; Naldini 1998, 259; Chapa 1998, 118. On $\nu\eta$ in Hellenistic and Roman unpretentious prose see Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v.; Mayser II 3, pp. 147-148. Cf. also Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 149, Turner, *Syntax* 336.

¹ = CPL 262 = Moscadi 1970 no. 1.

² = W.Chr. 128 = Sel. Pap. I 163 = Ghedini 1923 no. 35 = Döllstädt 1934 no. V = Naldini 1998 no. 61.

³ On the language of the Latin letter see Moscadi 1970, 102-104; CEL II pp. 325-329. For linguistic commentaries on P.Oxy. 939 see Ghedini 1923, 231-234; Döllstädt 1934, 59-71.

⁴ On the meaning of the word see especially Foraboschi 1968, 49. LSJ Rev.Suppl. s.v. is inaccurate.

⁵ Cf. P.Sarap. 89c.3 = SB VIII 9721 (another familiar letter of the late first or early second century), PSI XIII 1334.8 (iii AD), P.Oxy. XIV 1682.13 = Ghedini 1923 no. 26 = Naldini 1998 no. 52 (iv AD), P.Flor. III 371.4 (iv AD), P.Lond. V 1659.11 (iv AD: note that the

the connotation of the verb.

The rest of the period shows more evidence of stylistic refinement. Note the artificial word order μηθὲν . . . ἄλλο and the use of rhetorical figures such as hyperbole (τὰ ἐδόφη ¹) and periphrasis (τὴν ὄψιν σου instead of σε). The high level connotation inherent in the latter emerges not only from the early date of the papyrus — such periphrastic forms of address became very popular from the late Roman period —, but also from the fact that it occurs in a brother-to-brother familiar letter, where the simple pronoun σύ is otherwise used without exception (for refs. see A above). On the other hand, the choice of ἤθελον (predominantly found in popular Koine) instead of ἐβουλόμην (ἄν) (class., Koine) seems to represent a concession to lower level language.² In fact, no attempt was made to comply with the puristic requirements of linguistic Atticism: note the post-classical lexeme τεκνίον and the consistent rejection of moderate profile items in favour of standard non-puristic variants (2 exx. of cc for ττ [ll. 9, 10] and also μηθέν for μηδέν ³). There are also two misspellings (λλ for λ at l. 9, cf. Gignac I 155-156; ι for ει at l. 10), the second of which seems particularly serious, since it disfigures a verbal ending which was normally taught in schools.

C. νῦν γὰρ πάλι καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀπολλωτᾶ ἐχευ[ά]σθην· ὅταν γὰρ π[τε]ρώσωσιν παρ' ἐμοί, ἐμοῦ· ταλαιπ[ωρο]ῦντος ἰς τὸ πέλαγος, καὶ πλουτήσω[σι]ν, τότε καὶ ἐπιλαθόμενοι οἱ ἦσαν· παρ' ἐ[μοί] τότε καὶ νῦν οἱ εἰσὶν ἐπεμβαίνου[σί] μοι μᾶλλον (ll. 12-18).

'For I am now again tempest-tossed by Apollotas; when they spread the oars next to me while I am distressed at open sea, and when they become rich, then, even forgetful of the sort of men they were once next to me and now are, they will trample on me'.

An interesting element of literary style is the extended marine metaphor, which accounts for the unparalleled metaphorical application of the nautical sense of πτερόω (unclass.): individuals of unknown identity are apparently equated with a ship which spreads the oars (for this intransitive usage of the verb see Polyb. 1.46.9). An attempt at chiasmus also seems to occur at ll. 16-17 (ἐπιλαθόμενοι οἱ ἦσαν . . . τότε καὶ νῦν οἱ).

verb takes περί + gen. instead of the simple gen.). On the verb cf. also Moscadi 1970, 112; Chapa 1998, 113.

¹ On the unreal character of this plural see Foraboschi 1968, 47.

² On ἤθελον / ἐβουλόμην (ἄν) in Roman Koine see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 359,2; Turner, *Syntax* 91.

³ Phryn. *Ecl.* 153 Fischer condemned οὐθείς. A different viewpoint is apparent at *Praep. soph.* 91.16 de Borries (so MSS), but I agree with Bekker on regarding the transmitted text as incorrect.

εἰσίν).¹ On the other hand, certain elements point to clumsiness with high level Greek. 'Geminus' supplies no clue to the identity of the people whom he expects to do wrong to himself; they are introduced abruptly at l. 14 and are abandoned at l. 18.² Moreover, as the period is placed between aorists referring to the present and to the past (cf. ll. 13 and 21, respectively), it is unclear why it refers to future events. Finally, what does *περὶ* exactly allude to? The whole block exhibits significant linguistic deviations from high level Greek:

1. εἰς with the acc. for ἐν + dat. in a local sense (l. 15), cf. App. (B) § 1.6 C no. 4.
2. Genitive absolute with reference to a preceding word (ll. 14-15) (unclass.), cf. esp. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 423,4, where references to earlier and contemporary unpretentious prose (pap., *LXX*, *NT*, and other early Christian literature) will be found. Classical Greek and classicistic Koine prose would use a conjunctive participle.
3. Futuristic use of the present in a main clause (with τότε) concluding the future action of a temporal clause expressed by ὅταν + aor. subj. (ll. 17-18): cf. P.Oxy. XLI 2985.5-6 (ii/iii AD) ὅταν γὰρ τὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ οἰνάρια πραθῇ, τότε δύνασαι . . . ἰ . . . ἀγοράσαι; P.Oxy. VIII 1158.15-16 (iii AD) ὅταν εἰσενεχθῇ, πέμπω σοι; *NT Mt.* 5.11 μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς; *Mc.* 12.25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι. It is probably a characteristic of colloquial language, since the main verb usually appears in the future indicative (or in the imperative) even in the *NT* and in the papyri.³ In general, on pres. for fut. cf. App. (B) § 1.7 A no. 5.

A serious itacist mistake occurs at l. 15 (ἰς for εἰς).

¹ For a different understanding of the structure see Foraboschi 1968, 45 (trans.), 47, who proposed a correlation τότε καὶ . . . τότε καί = *cum . . . tum* (ll. 16-17) (but in that case, one should print τότε . . . τότε). In my opinion, (i) τότε at l. 16 resumes ὅταν at l. 14 (parallels are cited below, no. 3); (ii) the first καί means 'even'; (iii) the chiasmus accounts for the position of νῦν, which otherwise remains rather obscure.

² Foraboschi 1968, 50 spoke of 'nuovi ricchi'.

³ *NT*: Turner, *Syntax* 112. Papyri: (i) fut.: e.g. P.Oxy. LIX 3992.10-11 (ii AD); P.Oxy. XII 1581.8-10 (ii AD; but ὅταν is restored); P.Oxy. XII 1413.14,31 (AD 272/273, cf. *BL* VII 137); P.Oxy. XIV 1676.26-28 = *Sel.Pap.* I 151 (iii AD); P.Oxy. XLIX 3506.20-21 (iii AD); P.Oxy. XII 1415.10 (late iii AD); (ii) imp.: e.g. P.Oxy. VII 1062.6-7 (ii AD); P.Oxy. XLII 3063.9-11 (ii AD); P.Oxy. XXXVI 2784.18-19 (iii AD); iussive subj.: e.g. P.Oxy. XXXI 2597.9-10 (iii/iv AD). Cf. also Mandilaras 1973 § 412. For exx. of fut. with τότε see *Mt.* 25.31 ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . τότε καθίσει; *Lc.* 5.35; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ὅταν 1b.

D. ὥς καὶ ὁ ἰσχαρὸς (*sic*: a slip for ἰσχυρός ? ¹) ἰέραξ | τότε ἐπ[ο]ίη[σ]εν πάλιν
 σὺν αὐτῷ, ὥς νῦν | οὖν Δημήτριος | γενόμενος παρ' ἐμὲ ἐξ αὐτοψ[ί]ας ἐθεά-
 σατό με κλαίοντα πλείστοις | δάκρυσιν (ll. 18-22).²

'As that strong (?) hawk once behaved towards him, so, therefore, Demetrius
 came to me and personally saw me crying hot tears'.

A simile in literary style. ὥς . . . ὥς is Homeric (Kühner-Gerth II 446, LSJ s.v. ὥς Aa3) and occasionally Attic (Plat. *Resp.* 7.530d, where οὕτως is v.l. for ὥς), and was probably taken over as a higher level variant than normal ὥς . . . οὕτως. The whole period seems to contain a deliberate allusion to the story of the hawk and the nightingale as told in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (202-212).³ In view of its poetic resonance, ὥς . . . ὥς is likely to have been borrowed as a marker of poetic imitation. On the other hand, the construction of ποιέω with adv. and σύν + dat. of pers. 'treat sb. in a certain manner' is low-level post-classical Greek.⁴ To elevate the language above ordinary speech, it would have been sufficient to adopt the accusative instead of σύν + dat.

The rest of the letter is rich in misspellings: cf. ὀλι<γ>όψυχον (l. 50) ⁵ and the numerous cases of ι for ει (ll. 28 [2x], 33 [2x], 34, 36, 46, 51, 53 [2x], 56), the vast majority of which are serious blunders inasmuch as they affect εἰς(-) (ll. 33, 46, 53 [2x], 56; contrast 46), the 3rd person singular ending of the present indicative (ll. 34, 51; contrast 26, 34, 36, 42, 43), and the infinitive active (ll. 28, 33). There are also many features characteristic of lower stylistic strata. Two select items:

1. ὅτι *recitativum* (l. 39), cf. App. (B) § 1.7 D no. 6.

2. μεταδίδωμι + dat. of pers. + acc. and inf. 'to inform sb. that . . . ' (ll. 29-30), cf. App. (B) § 1.6 A (b) (where, however, the verb takes ὅτι + ind.).

The use of pleonastic λέγων after the main verb (γράφεις μοι) to introduce the content of a written document (λέγων = 'as follows') (l. 6) must also bear some special significance. Had the writer followed, whether deliberately or inadvertently, current unpretentious usage, he would have used ὅτι *recitativum*, just as he did at l. 39. Conversely, had he wished to conform to high-level literary usage, he would have

¹ For a different interpretation see Foraboschi 1968, 50.

² Unlike Foraboschi 1968, I take ὥς . . . τότε, ὥς νῦν as correlatives.

³ Cf. Foraboschi 1968, 50.

⁴ Cf. the cognate construction with μετά + gen. (Helbing 1928, 7). Both constructions developed from ποιέω with the simple dative, which was in turn common in low level Koine, see Helbing 1928, 3-4 (with further bibliography), 5-9; Radermacher 1925, 122; Mayser II 2, p. 264. 7-8; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 151,1; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ποιέω I 2aβ; Turner, *Syntax* 245. Prodrums are found in Attic, see LSJ s.v. ποιέω B [I] 2.

⁵ Cf. Gignac I 71 n. 1.

attached the quotation to γράφεις μοι. Close parallels for his abnormal conduct include:

- (i) a number of passages in the *LXX*, *NT*, and in related literature (cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. λέγω I 8b). These comprise:
 - *LXX* 2 *Regn.* 11.15 (καὶ ἔγραψεν ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ λέγων 'εἰσάγαγε κτλ.');
 - 4 *Regn.* 10.6 (καὶ ἔγραψεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς βιβλίον δεύτερον λέγων 'εἰ ἐμοὶ κτλ.');
 - 1 *Mac.* 8.31 (ἐγράψαμεν αὐτῷ λέγοντες 'διὰ τί ἐβάρυνας κτλ.') and 11.57 (καὶ ἔγραψεν Ἀντίοχος . . . λέγων 'ἴστημί σοι κτλ.');
 - *NT* *Lc.* 1.63 (ἔγραψεν λέγων 'Ἰωάννης ἐστὶν ὄνομα αὐτοῦ');
 - *Ios. Ant. Iud.* 11.26 (καὶ γράφει τάδε λέγων 'βασιλεὺς κτλ.');
- (ii) BGU II 523.5-7 (Fay., lett.) καὶ ἀντέγραψας λέγ[ω]ν 'πέμψον κτλ.'

In the *LXX* passages, ἔγραψεν λέγων corresponds to the Hebrew *yiktob le'mor* (יִכְתֹּב לֵאמֹר) and is closely connected (*pace* Kieckers) with the very frequent *LXX* and *NT* use of λέγων (sometimes λέγοντες or the like) before direct discourse to render the Hebrew infinitive construct *le'mor* (לֵאמֹר) (literally 'um zu sagen', 'so as to say').¹ As Kieckers (1915, 40-41) and others have pointed out, pleonastic λέγων before direct speech is also found in classical Greek. Numerous cases occur in Herodotus, but hardly any is found in other authors: Demosthenes, *De cor.* 51 represents an exception.² Phrases such as ἔφη λέγων uncomplemented by direct discourse also occur in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Aristophanes.³ Similarly, Verg. *Aen.* 11.784 has *sic voce precatur* 'summe deum . . .'; in Latin, pleonastic *voce* is often used after verbs of saying uncomplemented by direct speech.⁴ Ptolemaic papyri occasionally document pleonastic λέγων before quoted speech.⁵ They probably reflect an influence of Egyptian,⁶ for had the construction been a feature of genuine colloquial Greek, it would have enjoyed greater diffusion in later centuries, as in fact was the case of recitative ὅτι.

-
- ¹ On this usage cf. Kieckers 1915, 36-37 (on the *NT*) and 37 ff. (on the biblical Hebrew *le'mor*); Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 420; Turner, *Syntax* 155-156; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. λέγω I 8a; Tabachovitz 1956, 13; I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (Ann. Acad. Sc. Fenn. B 132.1, Helsinki 1965) 68-75; Turner, *Style* 52. Cf. also A. Aejmelaesus, *VT* 32 (1982) 387. The occasionally indeclinable use of λέγων has been regarded as dependent on a desire to reproduce the 'formular' character of the Hebrew construction (so Tabachovitz 1956, 13; *contra* Kieckers 1915, 41 n. 1).
 - ² Kieckers 1915, 34-35. None of his adduced occurrences in Plato and Plutarch is relevant, as in all of them λέγων has the function of a conjunctive participle. For example, Plato, *Gorg.* 492e Εὐριπίδης ἀληθῆ ἐν τοῖσδε λέγει λέγων 'τίς δ' οἶδεν κτλ.' means 'Euripides tells the truth in these things, *when* he says "who knows . . . ?"' (ἐν τοῖσδε refers not to the following quotation but to the matter under discussion, that is, to the fact that life is δεινός); recent editors (Burnet, Dodds, Croiset) place a comma after λέγει.
 - ³ Cf. e.g. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 205 and Dunbar on Aristoph. *Av.* 472, where more bibliography will be found.
 - ⁴ Cf. E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, II (Lund 1956) 185-186.
 - ⁵ Cf. Mayser II 3, p. 63.14; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 420; Turner, *Syntax* 155; Mandilaras 1973 §

Chapter Four

After being introduced by the translators of the *Pentateuch*, λέγων came to be canonised as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew *le'mor* and as a characteristic of biblical Greek. This accounts for its adoption into original Greek compositions which imitate the biblical style. Luke is believed to follow the *LXX* at 1.63 and elsewhere.¹ The same may apply to Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 11.26.

There is in fact much controversy about the text or texts of the Bible used by Josephus.² Yet it seems almost certain that he used a Greek text for the historical books. In particular, to consider but one of the above-mentioned books, arguments have been suggested in favour of the use in his *Antiquities* of a Greek text for 2 *Sam.* (= 2 *Regn.*).³

In the light of these data, the attestation of pleonastic λέγων in P.Mil.Vogl. 24 is both remarkable and difficult to assess. The construction might have been borrowed from a specific source. In particular, did 'Geminus' use one of the works listed at (i) above?

896.

- ⁶ For the Egyptian construction corresponding to Hebrew *le'mor* see Kieckers 1915, 45. It may be noted that UPZ I 6 (163 BC), where ἀπεκρίθησαν ἡμῖν φήσαντες is found (l. 30), comes from an Egyptian environment; on the Demotic background of P.Giss. I 36 see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 420.
- ¹ Cf. Kieckers 1915, 41; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 420, 3; Turner, *Syntax* 156; cf. Turner, *Style* 52.
- ² For a critical appraisal of modern literature see L.H. Feldman, in L.H. Feldman - G. Hata (edd.), *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (Leiden 1989) 352-355. The question is very complex: one must consider (i) the possibility that Josephus used texts of the Bible in more than one language (Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic); (ii) the existence of divergent recensions within each tradition, not all of which are known to us; (iii) Josephus' almost certain inconsistency and fluctuation in the use of reference texts.
- ³ Cf. E.C. Ulrich, Jr., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 19, 1978) 165-191, 217 ff., 223 ff. Still, there are cases of disagreement with the Greek text(s) known to us. This is also true of 2 *Sam.* 11, cf. T. Muraoka, *Abr-Nahrain* 20 (1981-1982) 39 on 2 *Sam.* 11.8. The question of whether the Greek text used by Josephus belonged to the Lucianic 'recension' (so A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus*

Book circulation perhaps offers no argument against this possibility.¹ Yet Geminus was a native Greek and a member of a family of gymnasiarchal rank (cf. App. (B) § 1.4), and if it is really him who wrote P.Mil.Vogl. 24, he is unlikely to have been acquainted with one or other of the historical books of the Bible, or with Josephus' *Antiquities*, or with Luke's Gospel, let alone to have appreciated their style. Indeed, he might have used an unknown source, but of what type? There are in fact possible alternatives. Did 'Geminus' imitate Herodotus' style? Or was λέγων the outcome of casual performance? Of course, bilingual interference cannot have influenced Geminus. Yet, notwithstanding his Greek ethnicity he might have reflected a type of colloquial Greek inclusive of Egyptian elements as spoken at Tebtynis, a town inhabited by a predominantly Egyptian population. This would be very interesting in terms of sociology of language. In this connection, BGU 523 adds to the issues, because it also comes from Fayum, probably from a non-Egyptian environment to judge from the names of the sender and the recipient. Unlike P.Mil.Vogl. 24, however, its style and language are thoroughly unsophisticated. Unfortunately, it is a loose letter for which no context can be provided, nor are we informed about the cultural background of the sender.

The interest of P.Mil.Vogl. 24 lies in the consistent, inextricable conflation of linguistic and stylistic ingredients belonging to widely diverging registers. This is most unlikely to be the outcome of planned composition. Perhaps insufficient linguistic competence prevented the writer from maintaining a high standard of refinement. If the writer was really Geminus, an interesting conclusion could be drawn: even an educated member of a Greek family of gymnasiarchal rank could unconsciously fail to comply with the requirements of high level Greek in his high-aiming written performance. In other words, possession of education, high social class, and Greek ethnicity did not necessarily imply ability to produce blameless high-level prose. The numerous misspellings suggest either that 'Geminus' was not offered a high standard of education during his years of study,² or that his linguistic competence regressed to a more primitive state after leaving school. Other elements point instead to a lack of higher rhetorical training. Perhaps a combination of all these factors was in operation.

1.2.2. Stylistically unbalanced performance could also originate from non-

untersucht für Buch V-VIII der Archäologie [Basel 1895]) or not (e.g. Rahlfs 1911, 83-111; Brock 1966, 214-221), has no bearing on the present usage, since there seems to have been no disagreement between the Lucianic recension and the other MSS about ἔγραψεν . . . λέγων, cf. Muraoka's paper.

¹ For instance, two early LXX papyri might come from Fayum, cf. J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiennes* (Paris 1976) nos. 56-57.

² For this problem see Ch. II §§ 1.6, 1.7.

Greek individuals. P. Oxy. I 122, a late second-century¹ letter from Gaianus, a high-ranking official, to Agenor, a prefect of an ala or a legion, is a case in point. An examination of the script shows that Gaianus had the body of the letter penned by a scribe, and then added the farewell.² As the editors have pointed out, the letter displays an influence of Latin script throughout. Latin was thus the native language of both Gaianus and the scribe. The papyrus exhibits clear indications of literary ambition. Breathings are used three times (App. (A) II 4), which points to an intention of providing the manuscript itself with literary respectability (cf. Ch. I § 3.3.2). Evidence of linguistic refinement is also found. Θᾶπτον (l. 6) represents the most prominent feature as it meets the requirements of linguistic Atticism and agrees with strongly puristic prose (Ch. III § 1.2.1, esp. 1.2.1.2.3). But other items may have originated from the same desire to avoid vulgar Greek. One of them is the retention of ᾗν in an unreal apodosis in the indicative (ll. 5-6). In such circumstances, the modal particle was frequently omitted in literary and non-literary unpretentious prose, and occasionally also by second-century Atticists and in the classicising prose writings of subsequent centuries.³ Another case might possibly be the use of Κρόνια (l. 4) to render Lat. *Saturnalia*;⁴ it may be noted that L. Bellienus Gemellus, an individual inclined to use colloquial language, adopted the transliteration Σατορνάλια.⁵ However, considering that Latin-Greek bilingual glossaries

-
- ¹ The date is my own (late iii or iv AD Grenfell-Hunt; iv AD Kenyon-Bell, *P.Lond.* III (1907) p. xxxiii no. 768). The script on the back, an early specimen of the 'chancery style', seems very similar to P.Brem. 6 front, a papyrus belonging to the early second-century archive of the strategus Apollonius; on the script see G. Cavallo, *Aegyptus* 45 (1965) 227-228 (pl. 1).
 - ² The distinction of hands is my own.
 - ³ Papyri: Moulton 200 n. 1; Mayser II 1, pp. 227-228 with H. Frisk, *Gnomon* 5 (1929) 39. *NT* and *LXX*: Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 360,1 (with further bibl.) (note the two cases of Atticising addition of ᾗν in the Lucianic recension of the *LXX*); Turner, *Syntax* 91-92. Atticists: Schmid I 245 (Lucian), IV 89 (Philostratus). Basil of Caesarea: Trunk 1911, 58; Synesius: Fritz 1898, 127. Later Byzantine periods: e.g. Böhlig 1956, 195 (Psell.).
 - ⁴ The equivalence Κρόνια = Egyptian Cronia, recently proposed by F. Perpillou-Thomas, *Fêtes d'Égypte ptolémaïque et romaine d'après la documentation papyrologique greque* (Studia Hellenistica 31, Louvain 1993) 105-107, is unconvincing.
 - ⁵ P.Fay. 119.28 of c. AD 100. For full bibliographic references to Gemellus' correspondence and to its language see App. (B) § 1.1. The form Σατορνάλια is also found in *Schol. Aristoph. Nub.* 398a (p. 97.6 Holwerda).

render *Saturnalia* with Κρόνια without exception,¹ we cannot exclude the possibility that the choice of the genuine Greek form implied an automatised linguistic act, even when used by native Latin speakers. Similar uncertainties affect the interpretation of ἔλαβον (l. 5). Gaianus may have deliberately avoided the vulgar ending ἔλαβα or may have instinctively reproduced his normal usage.

P.Oxy. 122, on the other hand, exhibits a variety of linguistic features characteristic of lower strata. The following items can be singled out for consideration:

- (i) στρατιῶται (l. 7);
- (ii) omission of the syllabic augment in the impf. (10 δυνάμεθα);
- (iii) omission of the syllabic augment in the plupf. (5 πεπόμφειν);
- (iv) unreal apodosis with the plupf. (with ἄν, see above) (l. 5).

(i) is a plain grammatical error. (ii) seems characteristic of vulgar Greek,² whereas (iii) is standard late Greek:³ unaugmented pluperfect forms are found even in a grammatical papyrus codex which might have been used for school instruction (Ch. II § 1.6). (iv) too is unclassical: it would probably have struck a purist as unacceptable usage, but it would not have displeased people uninterested in strictly puristic performance. This would account for its occurrences in unpretentious literature — if correct, a conjectured attestation in Clement of Alexandria's *Protreptic* may be explained as an accidental lapse from high level Greek.⁴ In Hermas' *Shepherd*, the use of the plupf. both in the protasis and in the apodosis of an unreal conditional sentence (*Sim.* 9.15.6) has been regarded as a Latinism (Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 360,3^{n.4}). In the same way, πεπόμφειν ἄν in Gaianus' letter might render Lat. *misissem*.⁵ (i), (ii), and (iv) thus

¹ Cf. *CGL* II 355.38; III 10.20, 83.74, 171.41, 239.27, 294.57, 371.55, 491.39, 524.52.

² For parallels in papyri see Mandilaras 1973 § 236 and Gignac II 225; neither includes the present occurrence. Cf. Psaltes 1913, 201.

³ For parallels in papyri cf. Mandilaras 1973 § 233; Gignac II 224. Imperial correspondence: Oliver 1989 no. 149.8 = TAM II 3 no. 905 XII D 3, p. 338 (AD 151, Pius to the Corydallians). Other sources, including literary texts: Helbing 1907, 70-71; Radermacher 1925, 84; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 66(1); Mandilaras 1973 §§ 234-236; Fritz 1898, 46 ff.; Böhlig 1956, 72 n. 1. Unaugmented forms are found even in the Atticists (Schmid I 83,228; II 21, III 34, IV 28, 591).

⁴ Papyri: P.Hib. I 73.15-16 (243 BC); P.Petrie II 3 (b).6 (iii BC) (both with ἄν). *NT* 2 *Io.* 2.19 (with ἄν). Other literature: Epict. 1.29.51 (without ἄν); Vett. Val. 7.6.188 p. 277.8 Pingree (with ἄν); Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 71.3 (with ἄν) (ἀναγράφει Par. gr. 451: ἐγγράφει and ἀνεγγράφει are conjectures accepted by Stählin and Marcovich, respectively). Cf. Moulton 201; Radermacher 1925,158; Mandilaras 1973 § 521; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 360,3; Turner, *Syntax* 91. In *NT Act.* 26.32 (cit. by Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf and Turner) the plupf. occurs in a protasis.

⁵ Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *GGA* 160 (1898) 684.

entail a remarkable stylistic clash with θῶτον. Whether Gaianus was responsible for all these features, we cannot tell. The scribe might have inadvertently introduced (i), (ii), and (iii), but not (iv). At least part of the unbalanced language of P.Oxy. 122 thus originated from the composer's mind. The non-Greek ethnicity of the writer, be he Gaianus or the scribe, influenced performance: no native Greek speaker could have ever made a serious morphological error such as στρατιῶτοι.

Moreover, Gaianus' Latin mother language seems to have influenced the construction of sentence. The letter exhibits no elaborate period and a simple clause order. But natural utterance is abandoned on more than one occasion. Emphasis accounts for the initial VS-order at ll. 5-6 (with S = αὐτός) and for the order of words at ll. 8-10. Both orderings contain elements of abnormality, but the latter seems particularly significant. The whole clause runs: ἡμεῖς] δὲ ἀγρεύειν τῶν θηρίων δυνάμε-
θα οὐδὲ ἓν (ll. 8-10). Three elements can be singled out for consideration:

- (1) the final position of οὐδὲ ἓν, separated from the partitive genitive to which it is related;
- (2) the penultimate position of the auxiliary, separating the two members of the 'compound object' ('no' + partitive);
- (3) the separation of the 'compound predicate' (auxiliary + infinitive).

We could describe the whole structure as $SqV^bO^bV^aO^a$ — S = subject; q = postpositive; V = compound predicate (V^a = auxiliary; V^b = infinitive); O = compound object (O^a = 'no' as a pronoun or adj.; O^b = substantive going with 'no'). The emphasis seems to be on final V^aO^a : 'could' and 'not a single' represent the nuclei on which the speaker's emotion focuses. Now, οὐδεῖς/οὐδὲν in Greek and *nemo/nullus* in Latin are mobile tokens which could be placed at every position within the clause. In its turn, the mobile to be emphasised could be placed in a variety of positions; in other words, no position within the clause seems to be more emphatic than others.¹ We thus need to determine the value of Gaianus' chosen word order. With this object in mind, I have investigated the various positions of the indefinite pronoun/adjective as an object in several prose writers. I have selected:

- a number of Latin writers, since Gaianus was a native Latin speaker: I have chosen Cicero, Seneca, Quintilian, Pliny the Younger;
- the main Attic prose writers, especially those who were regarded as models of good usage in the Roman period and/or who circulated widely in Graeco-Roman Egypt: Isocrates, Lysias, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Xenophon;
- some prose writers of the Roman period whose works belong to a variety of genres: I

¹ Cf. K.J. Dover, *Greek Word Order* 2nd ed. (Cambridge 1966).

have chosen historians such as Polybius and Dio Cassius, rhetors such as Lucian and Aelius Aristides, philosophers such as Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius.

My chosen sample seems both ample and representative. The results of the analysis are as follows:

1. In the presence of a compound predicate, just as in the present case, Greek and Latin prose fluctuates. Apart from individual preferences, the normal orders are those in which the two elements of the predicate are placed after the two elements of the compound object. This reflects the usual preference for the OV-order in literary Greek and Latin. The order chosen by Gaianus is very unusual. I have been able to find an instance only in Cic. *De orat.* 1.129 *saepe enim soleo audire Roscium, cum ita dicat se adhuc reperire discipulum, quem quidem probaret, potuisse neminem*, which also has the same position of Sq as P.Oxy. 122.

2. Of course, in the absence of contextual affinities, there is no good reason to assume that Gaianus was influenced precisely by this passage of *De oratore*. Yet the analogy does not seem to be a matter of chance. If we consider the order of words when a simple verb is involved, we obtain the following data (cf. Table 2):

- (a) In general, the preferential order is again that in which the verb follows the two elements of the object (especially O^aO^bV).
- (b) If the verb is included between the two elements of the object, almost all the writers by far prefer placing the indefinite pronoun/adjective *before* the verb (i.e., O^aVO^b).
- (c) Cicero, but not other Latin authors, deviates considerably from both tendencies, at least as far as *neminem* is concerned: his preferred order is precisely O^bVO^a .
- (d) Thucydides is the only Greek author who was inclined to place οὐδεὶς, οὐδέν as an object after the verb, but he appears to have employed this order of words far less frequently than Cicero, in terms both of absolute figures and percentage. Moreover, unlike Gaianus' utterance, three of Thucydides' attestations do not occur in *clausula*. The same phenomenon is found in all the other writers except Cicero, who also marked period- or colon-end 33 times with *neminem* as a simple object or as a subject of an acc. + inf. construction. This pronounced preference for the final position of *neminem* as opposed to *nullum/nullam* seems to depend on a desire to obtain ^t₁ ^a₂cretic *clausula*.

I am well aware of the risks inherent in assessing individual occurrences of linguistic phenomena in the light of general trends, but I believe that these data are sufficiently coherent to suggest that Gaianus' Greek was influenced by Cicero's style. Yet it is hard to specify the exact nature of his debt, as we ignore the mental mechanisms of Gaianus' normal second-language composition. Let us suppose, for instance, that the Greek

utterance of Gaianus does not represent a mental translation of a thought originally conceived in his mother language. As modern societies show, fluency of speech in a foreign language is not necessarily correlated with good command of its literary style. In such circumstances, unconscious lapses into the literary structures of one's own first language, or even the deliberate re-use of them, can disfigure attempts at pretentious second-language composition. Gaianus may have experienced this situation. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that he might have deliberately imitated Cicero's use of *neminem*. οὐδὲ ἔν appears to provide the period with a cretic *clausula*. Similarly, two more words, placed at the end of cola before and after οὐδὲ ἔν, happen to scan as cretic (8 ὁπέστρεφεν, 12 ἡδέ]ως¹). Is this a matter of chance, or was Gaianus eager to employ rhythmic *clausulae*? However implausible it may sound, the latter possibility seems worth of consideration in view of the occurrence of three apparent cretic *clausulae* in just five lines; in this connection, it may be noted that in *Orator* Cicero regarded such *clausulae* as characteristic of *oratio soluta*, and that they were occasionally borrowed in papyrus letters written by native Greeks (cf. §§ 1.1.1, 1.2.1 B).

There is an alternative possibility. Gaianus may have been accustomed to think in Latin first and then to translate his thought in Greek. Now, if translated into Latin, his sentence would run: *nos autem venari ferarum (or beluarum) potuimus nullam*.² Parallels for the final position of *nullam* after the verb are found in Cicero: cf. e.g. Cic. *De or.* 2.65 *sed locum suum in his artibus, quae traditae sunt, habent nullum*; *Verr.* 2.1.100 *multis nominibus, quorum in tabulis iste habet nullum*.³ Perhaps Gaianus echoed the style of Cicero, whether unconsciously or deliberately.

Despite these issues, it seems reasonable to conclude that the letter witnesses a unique instance of interference from the literary code of an individual's first language in his second-language everyday written communication. Another element of interest seems to lie in Gaianus' putative re-use of Cicero's style, as this conduct would fit in well to the prominent position of Cicero in contemporary Roman civilisation. Cicero was regarded as a model of Latin prose style⁴ and his works seem to have enjoyed conspicuous circulation in Roman Egypt; although most of the published papyri have been assigned to the fourth and fifth centuries, a fragment from a book

¹ The supplement, proposed by Wilamowitz, suits the spacing and the traces.

² Cf. Cic. *De nat. d.* 35.97 *beluarum nulla*.

³ For more data see Table 2.

⁴ In later times, Cicero's language was also studied by the Greeks, as is indicated by the existence of Greek word-lists to his orations (R.E. Gaebel, *BRL* 52 [1969-1970] 296-297; Wouters 1988, 95-96) as well as by the occasional addition of interlinear and marginal Greek translations into a book of *Divinatio in Q. Caecilius* (Wouters 1988, 98).

Chapter Four

containing the second Verrine and allegedly dating from the time of Augustus has survived (P.land. V 90).¹ The absence of second- and third-century manuscripts is likely to be a matter of chance.

TABLE 2. *The position of οὐδέν/nemo/nullus as an object in the sentence*

		O ^a O ^b V		O ^b O ^a V		O ^a VO ^b		O ^b VO ^a		VO ^a O ^b		VO ^b O ^a	
		nos.	%	nos.	%	nos.	%	nos.	%	nos.	%	nos.	%
Thucydides		8	17.39	11	23.91	9	19.56	8	17.39	4	8.69	6	13.04
Xenophon		72	43.37	53	31.92	14	8.43	4	2.40	8	4.81	15	9.03
Lysias		27	38.57	21	30	14	20	2	2.85	2	2.85	4	5.71
Isocrates		70	53.84	21	16.15	32	24.61	0	0	5	3.84	2	1.53
Demosthenes		114	39.58	85	29.51	36	12.5	11	3.81	17	5.90	25	8.68
Aelius Aristides		86	46.23	48	25.80	19	10.21	6	3.22	11	5.91	16	8.60
Lucian		63	56.25	26	23.21	18	16.07	1	0.89	3	2.67	1	0.89
Epictetus		13	38.23	6	17.64	14	41.17	0	0	0	0	1	2.94
Marcus Aurelius		10	76.92	2	15.38	1	7.69	0	0	0	0	0	0
Polybius		37	28.90	32	25	29	22.65	4	3.12	12	9.37	14	10.93
Cicero	<i>neminem</i>	13	22.03	8	13.55	8	13.55	21	35.59	2	3.38	7	11.86
	<i>nullum/-am</i>	107	42.62	96	38.24	32	12.74	13	5.17	2	0.79	1	0.39

V = verb O^a = οὐδέν/nemo/nullus as an object O^b = substantive going with O^a

¹ Lists of published Cicero papyri: Pack² 2918-2924; P. Mertens, in *Miscel.lània papyrològica Ramon Roca-Puig* (Barcelona 1987) 189-204. On P.land. V 90 see most recently G. Ballaira, *Esempi di scrittura latina dell'età romana*, I (Alessandria 1993) 83-99 (with full bibliography).

1.3. GENERALISED REFINEMENT: AMBITION AND SUCCESS

1.3.0. Several papyrus letters occur which are characterised by greater stylistic balance. As expected, they do not exhibit thorough avoidance of post-classical features; what actually distinguishes them from the letters examined in § 1.2 is their successful avoidance of lower level words, forms, and syntactical constructions. Moreover, the individuals who wrote them appear to have been much more skilled at handling the stylistic tools of high level Greek. I shall illustrate the most significant examples. In the first place, I shall focus on two letters which antedate the propagation of letter-writing as a literary genre by one or two centuries (§§ 1.3.1-1.3.2). Then I shall discuss a number of pretentious letters dating from the early fourth century (§ 1.3.3-1.3.4). They are a few decades earlier than the correspondence of Libanius and Gregory of Nazianzus, but the writers appear to have had the same inclination to high-level epistolary performance as those influential intellectuals.

1.3.1. I shall start with P.Mil.Vogl. I 11 = CPF I 1* 6, a brief letter assigned to the late first century or to the first half of the second (App. (A) I 3). It was addressed by a certain Theon to a Heracleides, who is called φιλόσοφος (perhaps 'scholar, lettered man' rather than 'philosopher'), and was meant to accompany the dispatch of philosophical books. Palaeography suggests that Theon hired the services of a scribe and asked him for a literary presentation of the manuscript (App. (A) I 3; cf. Ch. I § 3.3.2). He dignified the practical function of the letter by including thoughts on the benefit (ὠφέλεια) of philosophical books. He also took much care over style and language. Of the alternative formulae for the introductory salutations he selected the more classicising and 'philosophical' variant (εὖ πράττειν).¹ He pursued elegance in sentence construction and word order. Ll. 3-8, for example, are characterised by periodic style. The structure consists of a comparative clause followed by the main clause (and tied together with it by means of ὥσπερ . . . οὕτως) and a genitive absolute. Each of them develops into further dependent clauses. The whole sequence makes up a well-rounded period. Moreover, Theon had a marked fondness for hyperbaton in the order not only of clauses but also of words within the clause. The phrase 'I think (= token 1) that it is convenient for you (= token 2) not to be negligent in reading them (= token 3)' is arranged as follows: 2+1+3. Similarly, whenever the predicate governs a two-member object (i.e., adj. + subst.), Theon included the verb between the adjective and the

¹ On this choice formula see Vogliano, *P.Mil.Vogl. I* (1937) p. 20; Koskenniemi 1956, 163; Linguisti, *CPF I 1** p. 113; Chapa 1998, 64. Further bibliography will be found in those works.

substantive (type O^aVO^b), be this anarthrous (l. 3 πᾶσαν εἰσφέρομαι σπουδὴν) or arthrous (ll. 3-4 τὰ χρήσιμα κατασκευάζειν βιβλία). He also placed the genitive before its prepositional adjunct (l. 6 αὐτῶν πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν). These are normal characteristics of artistically-developed prose. Theon also borrowed elements of refined language. The expression ἀμελῶς ἔχω πρὸς + acc. (l. 6) has precursors in classical Greek, see *Xen. Oec.* 2.7 (ἀμελῶς ἔχω πρὸς + articular inf.); cf. also *Cyr.* 1.2.7 (ἀμελῶς ἔχω περί + acc.), *Plat. Leg.* 932a (ἀμελῶς ἔχω + gen.). The use of the singular verb with a neuter plural subject is a marker of distinction from lower level Greek, where agreements with plural verbs are very common.¹ Yet, in spite of the above connection with Attic prose, and of an occurrence of ττ in the initial greeting formula (l. 2 εὖ πράττειν), Theon did not imitate classical Greek consistently. The following items are not attested in extant classical literature:

(i) the periphrasis εἰσφέρομαι πᾶσαν σπουδὴν with the inf. (l. 3),² which was presumably preferred to σπουδάζω with the inf. because of its emphatic connotation;

(ii) the lexeme εὐχρηστία 'profit' (l. 7).

Moreover, Theon preferred the standard Koine verb καθήκει to its variant προσήκει (l. 5), which is better attested in classical Greek and was later accepted as puristic by strict Atticists (cf. *Antiatt.* 105.12 Bekker).

Theon's refined performance is remarkable, because not all the letters concerning books exhibit special concern for style. P.Oxy. LXIII 4365, a fourth-century letter about the lending of Christian books, for instance, shows no effort to nobilitate subject-matter, nor indeed any stylistic pretension.

1.3.2. Another refined text is P.David 14 (= P.Stras. IV 169 + P.Ross.Georg. II 43), a letter from a certain Dios to a friend called Eutychides which has been assigned to the second or possibly third century. It contains a request for help (l. 23 ff.), prefaced by fairly long thoughts on friendship (ll. 3-17). Like Theon in P.Mil.Vogl. I 11, Dios had the letter written by a scribe, whom he asked for a literary presentation of the manuscript (App. (A) III 1). The preamble exhibits elements characteristic of artistic composition. Words within the clause appear to have been carefully arranged. In particular, Dios seems to have had a marked inclination to separate closely-related elements with the predicate;³ the repetition of ἐστιν at l. 15 seems a mere slip (see

¹ Cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 133; Turner, *Syntax* 312-313.

² Cf. *TGL* III 341 B s.v. εἰσφέρομαι; *LSJ* s.v. εἰσφέρομαι II 4; add e.g. *Heliod.* 1.32.1.

³ Cf. ll. 3-4 οὐ διὰ λόγων . . . δείκνυνται ἀλλὰ δι' ἔργων; 5-7 μάλιστα[α] ἢ πρὸς ἀλλήλους φιλ[ί]α φανερά[α] ἐστιν . . . ἢ δι' ἔργων; 8-10 [ἀ]ξιόλογ[ός] ἐστι καὶ [θ]εοφιλῆς κ[α]ὶ . . . [ἐ]παινετή; 12-15 οὐδὲν γὰρ μεῖζόν ἐστιν οὐδὲ ἐράσμιον οὐδὲ ἡμ[ερῶ]τατον.

below).

The language is characterised by a moderately puristic profile (Ch. III § 1.3.3 III B) and by the use of a number of distinctly literary words. The lexeme ἐράσμιος (l. 8), for instance, seems to be a classicising item: found originally in Ionic lyric poetry (Anacr. 95.1 Gentili = *PMG* 375.1, Sem. 7.52 West²) and then borrowed into Attic drama (Aeschylus) and prose (Plato, Xenophon),¹ it was used by classicising writers in the first to fourth centuries AD.² The verb ἀποσκήδνημι (ll. 29-30), found in classical Greek (Hom. *Il.* 23.4, Herodt. 4.113, Thuc. 6.98.3), occurs in post-classical historiography and biography;³ in this papyrus, it is characterised by an unparalleled metaphorical meaning and by the unclassical use of the active instead of the middle (*DGE* III 452 s.v.). The letter, however, also exhibits linguistic inconsistencies. At ll. 13-15, what had originally been conceived as a sequence of four comparatives is marred by the infiltration of a positive (ἐράσμιον) and a superlative form (ἡμ[ερώ]τατον). The former could be defended as a feature of late Greek,⁴ but considering the context I prefer regarding it as a mere slip, just as the superlative and ἐστίν at l. 15. I wonder whether they derive from Dios' mind or from the scribe's pen.

1.3.3. Certain of the typological characteristics of P.Mil.Vogl. I 11 and P.David 14 are also found in a late third- or fourth-century Christian letter of introduction (P.Oxy. XXXI 2603).⁵ The sender, Paul, and the recipient, Sarapion (?), may have been outstanding clerics.⁶ Like Theon and Dios in previous centuries (§§ 1.3.1-1.3.2), Paul not only had the manuscript furnished with a refined outward presentation (App. (A) III 4), but also dignified the practical function of the letter by prefacing the commendatory phrases proper with general reflections on the recognition of friendly affection. This rhetorical preamble takes the form of a long simile 'consisting of a developed commonplace applied to the recipient in a transitional comparison'.⁷ Paul

¹ Cf. Fraenkel on Aesch. *Agam.* 605.

² Cf. Schmid III 198; Fabricius 1962, 88. It does not occur elsewhere in the non-literary papyri, and it is missing in the *LXX* and the *NT*.

³ Cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.76, Appian. *Hist. Rom. Annib.* 13.57 (I 151.4 Vier.-Roos-Gabba), Zonar. *Epit. hist.* 8.26c (II 247 Dind.) (from Dio Cassius, book 14), Plut. *Marc.* 10.1, *Fab.* 11.7, *Camill.* 23.1.

⁴ On the use of the positive instead of the comparative when the comparison is introduced by ἢ (just as here) see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 245,3; Turner, *Syntax* 31-32.

⁵ See Appendix (A) I 25. The letter, published originally by Harrop 1962, has been re-edited by Naldini (1998 no. 47).

⁶ Cf. Harrop 1962, 137-139; Naldini 1998, 212.

⁷ For reflections on the rhetorical pattern of the preamble see Harrop 1962, 136-137. The quotation is taken from p. 136.

exploited the metaphor of the Mirror, antecedents for which can be found in classical and post-classical literature, both secular and Christian.¹ The letter and the preamble in particular are characterised by a fluent style and the adoption of several characteristics of literary Greek; note the use of chiasmus (ll. 23-24); the inclusion of the verb between closely-related elements (ll. 12-13, 14-15); the repetition of the article before a prepositional adjunct (ll. 11-12); the use of the singular verb with a neuter plural subject (l. 4). The choice of the formula εὖ πράττειν for normal χαίρειν seems a further marker of cultivation (cf. § 1.3.1).

1.3.4. Unfortunately, each of the letters discussed in §§ 1.3.1-1.3.3 represents the only text which has survived from the presumably extensive epistolary production of its writer. This fact prevents us from examining to what extent personal style changed according to circumstances. In particular, did Theon, Dios, and Paul *always* embellish their everyday correspondence on practical matters with rhetorical elaboration and stylistic refinement? Greater opportunities to investigate such problems are offered by a set of private letters dating from the early fourth century, which sheds light on Theophanes, a well-to-do man from Hermopolis who was gymnasiarch in 321 (CPR XVII A 18. 3), served as a *scholasticus* in the staff of the *rationalis* of Egypt in 321-324, and made a trip to Syria, possibly in 322 or 323, where he contacted the governor.² The letters, which seem to constitute a major part of Theophanes' own *dossier* of private papers, can be formed into four groups:

Group 1: P.Herm. 2 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 7), P.Herm. 3 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 8), SB XII 10803 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 12). All of them were written by an archprophet called Anatolius, probably in his own hand. They are addressed to three different recipients. Theophanes is mentioned in all of them as letter-carrier — evidently the letters never reached their final destination.³

Group 2: P.Ryl. IV 624 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 4), P.Herm. 6 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 11). Both were addressed to Theophanes and were penned by one and the same professional scribe on behalf of different senders.

Group 3: P.Herm. 4 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 9 = Naldini 1998 no. 38), P.Herm. 5 (= Moscadi

¹ Cf. Harrop 1962, 139-140; Naldini 1998, 215, 442-443.

² On this archive in general see H. Cadell, 'Les archives de Théophanes d'Hermoupolis: documents pour l'histoire', in *Egitto e storia antica* (Bologna 1989) 315-323. For the dates of Theophanes' service as a *scholasticus* and of his trip to Syria see K.A. Worp, *CPR XVII A* (1991) p. 50; Bagnall 1993, 271 n. 76. The letters, including the item written to introduce Theophanes to the governor of Syria (now CEL I 222), have been collected and re-edited by Moscadi 1970, who also produced a line-by-line commentary on their language.

³ Cf. Moscadi 1970, 119.

1970 no. 10 = Tibiletti no. 27). Both were addressed to Theophanes and were penned by one and the same professional scribe on behalf of different senders. Group 4: P.Ryl. IV 625 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 5), P.Ryl. IV 626 (= Moscadi 1970 no. 6). Both were written by Theophanes, who had recourse to the services of one or possibly two different scribes.

Almost all these letters are highly pretentious.

1.3.4.1. Two of Anatolius' letters (Group 1) exhibit palaeographical devices characteristic of literary manuscripts (App. (A) II 10,11). One of them, P.Herm. 2, is characterised by a high-level puristic profile¹ and by borrowings from literary language throughout. The following features seem particularly significant:

1. ὡς denoting direction + acc. of pers. (ll. 7, [15]), found in class. (Kühner-Gerth I 471-472, 548) and post-classical literary prose (Polyb., Plut., Strab., the Atticists), but only once in the *LXX* (as a *v.l.* [Sinaiticus] for πρὸς !) and never in the *NT* and the papyri (apart from another letter of Anatolius, see below);²
2. ὅτε + participle (l. 4), missing in the *NT* and exceedingly rare in the papyri;³
3. the repetition of the article before prepositional attributives (l. 25);
4. ἔνθεν μὲν . . . ἔνθεν δέ (ll. 8-10), class. (e.g. Xen. *Anab.* 3.5.7), foreign to late unpretentious prose;
5. the repeated use of correlatives τε . . . καί (ll. 23-24, 25-26);
6. the careful use of particles: cf. esp. τοιγαρο[ὺν] (*ed.pr.*, Rea) or τοιγάρ (Manfredi) (l. 12): the former is uncommon, though by no means foreign to unpretentious prose,⁴ whereas the latter would be a remarkable poeticism;⁵
7. the lexeme ὀξιάγαστος (l. 5): found in class. (Xen.) and high level late Greek,⁶ it was even glossed by lexicographers (Συν. λέξ. χρησ., ed. Bekker, *Anecd. Gr.* I 412.24);

¹ Ch. III § 133 (I). Cf. also the repeated use of ἀπαραίτητος (ll. 7-8, 12, 14), which was approved of by Phryn. *Ecl.* 287 Fischer.

² Cf. Muraoka 1964-65, 71. Atticists: Schmid IV 631.

³ Cf. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig 1913, repr. 1956) 18 n. 2. Papyri: Moscadi 1970, 122; add P.Wisc. I 1.13 (early ii AD, judicial proceedings).

⁴ Cf. e.g. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich *s.v.* On its position in the sentence see Blomqvist 1969, 130. Cf. also Wahlgren 1995, 110-111.

⁵ Cf. LSJ *s.v.*, *GP*² 565; it seems foreign even to the Atticists. Incidentally, Moscadi's assessment of γοῦν (l. 6) is unfortunate (Moscadi 1970, 98 n. 6, 122): the particle occurs frequently in unpretentious prose, see e.g. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich *s.v.* and such papyri as P.Oxy. XXXIV 2713.18, XL 2903.11, 2906 col. ii [13], 2909.15, 2910 cols. i [2] & ii 11, 2912.13 (all iii AD; 2903-2912 are applications to officials; all the *exx.* of γοῦν occur in one and the same formula). The reading ἦ μὲν (*ed.pr.*) (ll. 12-13) is very probably incorrect, see Moscadi's note.

⁶ Moscadi 1970, 122. It also occurs in Cyril of Alexandria, see Lampe *s.v.*

Moscadi (1970, 122) correctly observed that Anatolius treated it as a superlative of ἄξιος;

8. the use of an unusual and seemingly personal farewell formula (ll. 28-32).

The letter also displays elaborate periods: see especially ll. 5-12 (inclusive of a parenthetic sentence consisting of a main clause followed by a relative clause) and 19-26 (the main clause is lost; after the break, we have a genitive absolute and two consecutive relative clauses, the second of which is expanded by means of correlatives τε . . . καί).

The other letters are shorter and therefore less informative than P.Herm. 2, but they exhibit an equally fluent style and a refined language. In P.Herm. 3, the following features merit consideration:

- A. the rhetorically-constructed sequence ἡ[τ]ύχηται . . . τυχεῖν (l. 8);
- B. the use of an artificial order of words at ll. 4-5 τὸν τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σοφίας προστάτην;
- C. the occurrence of a gnomic sentence characterised by an iambic rhythm (ll. 6-7) and apparently constructed on the basis of literary linguistic materials;¹
- D. ὥς denoting direction + acc. of pers. (l. 11), just as in P.Herm. 2 (see above, no. 1);
- E. the very elaborate farewell (note τε . . . καί and the artificial word order), expanding the first part of the farewell in P.Herm. 2.

On the other hand, the use of the neuter plural instead of the masculine plural with reference to a sequence of two co-ordinated masculine singular nouns (ll. 13-15) is odd.

Anatolius also borrowed elements of refined style in SB XII 10803. The letter unusually starts with a rhetorical question. A further case of ὥς + acc. of pers. seems to have occurred at l. 9. Choice vocabulary is found on two occasions: the predominantly poetic lexeme ἀγλαΐσμα is used metaphorically in the farewell to qualify the recipient's excellence; ἥξει at l. 13 was substituted with ἐλεύσεται at a later stage, presumably for the sake of variation (ἥκειν had already been used at l. 9).

Besides displaying an equal consideration for higher level language, the three letters appear to share other characteristics. All of them originate from Anatolius' desire to contact distant acquaintances; the actual occasion on which they were written is the same; and in each of them Anatolius vindicates his choice of the occasion. The only divergence lies in the choice of the justification. In essence, the analogies and the differences may be set out schematically as follows:

¹ See Moscadi 1970, 128.

Chapter Four

subject	P.Herm. 2	P.Herm. 3	SB 10803
(mtf) conversation with recipient (in spoken or written form) is necessary and desirable	x	x	(x)
(tr ^a) impossibility for personal contact	x		
(tr ^b) the Gods provide the opportunities		x	
(tr ^c) who may facilitate it ?			x
(oc) Theophanes' intervention represents an opportunity for writing	x	x	x

(mtf = main motif; oc = occasion; tr = transitional variant)

Finally, all the three letters are likely to have been written at about the same time, possibly in the same day.¹ Anatolius was evidently accustomed to perform formal and premeditated linguistic acts at least in *certain* of his everyday letters. One wonders to what extent this inclination was influenced by the personality of the recipient(s). Ambrosius, the addressee of P.Herm. 3, must have been a well-educated man, as Anatolius describes him as πάνσοφος (l. 1) and greets him as 'champion of the Wisdom (σοφία) of the Greeks'. There is certainly some exaggeration in these epithets, but Ambrosius was undoubtedly viewed as a lettered man. On the other hand, there is no secure clue to the level of education of the recipients of the other two letters; but they are unlikely to have been as learned as Ambrosius, since the complimentary words with which they are greeted are not allusive to the realm of culture. As (tr^b) consists of a gnomic sentence constructed with stock literary material, we may suppose that it was chosen to please 'all-wise' Ambrosius. But there is evidence to suggest that the language and style proper of the letters were not accommodated to the recipients. As we have seen, P.Herm. 2, which is not addressed to Ambrosius, is an exceedingly pretentious letter. Unlike (tr^b) and (tr^c), (tr^a) has no rhetorical connotation, but the theme is conveyed with highly recherché language. Moreover, a literary feature such as ὥς + acc. of pers. occurs in all the three letters. One then wonders whether Anatolius was equally eager to produce high-level epistolary compositions in other circumstances. For instance, did he use ὥς or πρὸς in his familiar correspondence ? More generally, did he pursue artful performance while writing to members of his family ? Unfortunately these issues defy solution.

1.3.4.2. Both letters belonging to Group 2 are characterised by lectional signs and punctuation marks (App. (A) II 13, 14), as well as by a highly pretentious style

¹ This seems to be a likely inference from the fact that they were all written when Theophanes passed through the city in which Anatolius lived.

and language. In P.Herm. 6, a certain Besodorus writes to his 'brother' Theophanes,¹ expressing a longing for him and wishing him a safe return and successful accomplishment of his objects. This theme is dealt with at length, and is elaborated with the addition of sayings and proverbial expressions (cf. ll. 8-10, 14-15, 21-22). The language exhibits puristic lexical variants, although the exact assessment of the profile is problematic (Ch. III § 1.3.3 II A), and also several other choice words. In particular, three lexemes merit special consideration:

1. πόθος (l. 3) instead of commoner ἐπιθυμία, which is used at l. 11. Parallels for the sense used in P.Herm. 6 ('longing for a distant person') are attested for Plato's *Cratylus* and a letter of Julian;²
2. ἀμέτρητος, of time (l. 9);
3. διακράζω 'raise a clamour about sth.' (l. 18); the verb occurs twice in Aristophanes (LSJ s.v.), and re-appears in later literary Greek (Cyril, Damasus [Lampe s.v.], Photius [TGL II 1192 s.v., Moscadi 1970, 144]), probably as a classicistic loan.³ The present sense is unclassical.

Furthermore, words are frequently co-ordinated with synonyms or with lexemes of related meaning rhetorically to reinforce the idea to be conveyed:⁴ cf. πολὺς . . . καὶ ἀμέτρητος (9), ἐπιμελεῖς καὶ σφόδρα εὐκταῖον (16), πιστεύω . . . καὶ θαρρῶ (18-19), μεθ' ἡδονῆς καὶ χαρᾶς (24), βούλομαι τε καὶ εὐχομαι (30-31). In οὐδέν τι ἀη[θ]ές οὐδ' ἄτοπον (l. 19) (ἀη[θ]ές Moscadi : ἀη[δ]ές Rees), Moscadi detected an influence of Plato.⁵ Besodorus employed syntactical constructions characteristic of refined literary prose style:

- A. simple gen. with ἀπαλλάττω (ll. 10-11), as in artful prose (ἀπό, ἐκ + gen. predominate in the *LXX*, *NT*, and the papyri);⁶ in general, verbs of separation take the simple genitive more frequently than ἀπό, ἐκ + gen. in classicising Koine writers;⁷

¹ This may indicate (i) true brotherhood, (ii) friendship, (iii) similarity of age and status (see e.g. P.Oxy. LVI 3859 [liv AD; it has the same opening formula τῷ δεσπότῃ μου καὶ ἀδελφῷ], J. Rea, *P.Oxy.* LV [1988] p. 201). In this case, none of these possibilities can be ruled out in principle.

² Cf. Moscadi 1970, 142.

³ I cannot agree with Moscadi 1970, 98 n. 5 on regarding διακράζω as a typical example of 'forma popolareggiante'.

⁴ On cumulation of synonyms cf. Zilliacus 1967, 37 ff., 50.

⁵ Cf. Moscadi 1970, 144, who cites *Tim.* 48b and *Leg.* 797a.

⁶ Fabricius 1962, 39-40.

⁷ Cf. Fabricius 1962, 48 ff.; Fabricius 1967, 192-193.

- B. final ὅπως instead of ἵνα (l. 17): cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 5;
- C. unreal conditional sentence characterised by εἰ + impf. (protasis) and impf. with ἄν (apodosis), as in classical Greek;
- D. dative of agent with the aorist passive (l. 16 τῶν . . . σοι κατορθωθέντων), a high-level literary construction.¹ It may be noted that unlike Besodorus Theodoret of Cyrus, whose language was described by Photius as characterised not only by purity (τῷ καθαρῷ) but also by Attic nobility and even excessive elaboration in syntax,² employed ὑπό + gen. to express the agent with κατορθωθέντα (*Hist. rel.* 4.13.11). A case of a dative with the aorist passive is found in Marinus' *Life of Proclus* (299 Masullo).

The style is very fluent and elegant. The writer made use of elaborate periods characterised by hypotaxis and rhetorical figures. The first period (ll. 3-6), for instance, displays hyperbaton in the main clause (l. 3 ἦν . . . ἐνκεῖ[μ]εν[ος] ³) and a sequence of hendyadis (strengthened with correlatives: τῇ σῇ . . . ἐπιφανείᾳ τε καὶ λαμπρότητι = τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς σῆς λαμπρότητος) and chiasmus (τὸ ἀναπίμπλασθαι ἡδονῆς καὶ τ[ῶ]ν βουλομένων τυχεῖν) ⁴ in the subsequent relative clause.

P.Ryl. IV 624 is a familiar letter from Hephaestion and Origen to their father Theophanes. They thank him for taking them to Alexandria, where they are presently based. They express a longing for him, and communicate their constant zeal to ask for news about his state of health. This theme, modelled upon a fairly common motif in papyrus letters, is enriched with reflections on filial piety, consisting of a moral saying (ll. 15-17) and further thoughts, which start at l. 18 and are perhaps carried on down beyond l. 21. Ample periods, characterised by heavy hypotaxis, are used: ll. 3-9 represent a case in point. Like P.Herm. 6, P.Ryl. 624 displays several associations of synonyms and lexically related words: see l. 11 ὁλοκλη[ρίας] τε καὶ [ύγ]ι[ε]ίας; 14-15 πρῶτον καὶ πάντων διαφέρον; 16 κήδεσθαι καὶ φροντίζειν. The language is characterised by a mild puristic profile (Ch. III § 1.3.3 III A) and by the frequent use of choice words; note:

- I. χάριν ἐπίσταμαι (l. 5), cf. Ch. III § 1.3.3 III A;

¹ Cf. Hult 1990, 43-44 (general information on the dative of agent in Koine prose), 45-46, 50, 51-52, 55, 58, 61, 64, 65-66 (on the usage of fifth-century biographers).

² *Bibl.* 'cod.' 203 (164a. 32-35 Henry) ἡ συνθήκη τῆς ἀττικῆς εὐγενείας οὐ φεύγει τὰς γονάς, πλὴν εἴ τι περιεργότερον αὐτῆς ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς ὥς φάναι πολλῶν ἀκοῆς ἀνακεχωρηκός. On purity see *ibid.* l. 24. For modern assessments of Theodoret's language see Hult 1990, 25.

³ καί is not used to co-ordinate two different clauses; for the sequence τις καὶ πολὺς cf. l. 27.

⁴ Moscadi's translation of this passage (1970, 140) is incorrect.

Chapter Four

- II. καταλιμπάνω (l. 10) for commoner καταλείπω, cf. Moscadi 1970, 112;
- III. φιλοπευστέω 'inquire about' (l. 10) for commoner synonyms such as ἐξετάζω and ζητέω, cf. Moscadi 1970, 112;
- IV. ἐνευδοκιμέω (l. 17), class. (Dem. 18.198) and high-level post-class. (e.g. Plut., Luc., Ael. Arist.);¹
- V. ἐστία 'house' (l. 27), cf. Zilliacus 1967, 78; Moscadi 1970, 113;
- VI. perhaps also κήδομαι (l. 16), but see § 1.2.1 B.

Nos. I and III are unclassical, but generally occur in sources belonging to higher registers.

It seems that Besodorus penned not only the farewell at the end of his letter, but also the farewell at the foot of P.Ryl. 624 on behalf of Theophanes' youthful sons.² Besodorus was presumably to look after them at Alexandria during their father's prolonged absence. As a man probably resident in Alexandria ³ he may have been a faithful acquaintance or a brother of Theophanes. Considering that the main bodies of P.Herm. 6 and P.Ryl. 624 were penned by one and the same scribe, and that their farewell formulae were appended by Besodorus, presumably at about the same time, their common use of ambitious language and style is very probably the result of choices made by one and the same person. It may be noted that the letters exhibit further internal analogies: (i) the inclination to re-elaborate the same theme by means of moral reflections and proverbial expressions; and (ii) the frequent use of rhetorical combinations of synonyms. Neither element would in itself be sufficient to sustain the burden of proof, but their complementary presence supports the conclusion that the letters were indeed composed by the same individual. As Besodorus' handwriting is very practised, his recourse to the services of a scribe was entirely a matter of choice and did not depend on illiteracy. He is thus likely either to have entrusted one and the same scribe with the task of composing and penning both letters, or to have personally composed and dictated their texts to him. Similarly, the unusually great number and

¹ Schmid I 309, III 174. The label 'rhetorical word' (Moscadi 1970, 112), however, seems inappropriate.

² In my opinion, P.Herm. 6. 33-34 is by the same hand as P.Ryl. 624. 35, though very little of the latter survives for comparison. Note also that both farewell formulae unusually extend in breadth and are not confined to the the right-hand corner of the written space. That Hephaestion and Origen were still children or young boys depending on their parents is suggested by the fact that (i) they thank their father for taking them to Alexandria, (ii) they are left there by him before continuing his journey. The situation could be compared with P.Oxy. I 119, where a young boy writes to his father, begging to be taken to Alexandria. In that case, the child writes the letter in his own hand, but slowly and clumsily (p. 36 n. 3), and his language is very colloquial (Ch. I § 4.4.2).

³ I infer this from the expression τῇ σῇ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐκάστη ἐπιφανείαι (P.Herm. 6. 4).

variety of lectional signs are attributable either to the scribe's own initiative or to specific instructions imparted by Besodorus.

P.Ryl. 624 seems to have been composed with a view to emphasising the personality of Theophanes' children. This attitude emerges particularly from a comparison between passages from the two letters in which common themes are exploited in different manners. In P.Herm. 6, Besodorus expresses his eagerness to be informed about the outcome of Theophanes' business abroad (ll. 15-31), whereas in P.Ryl. 624 the interest of Theophanes' young sons lies in their father's state of health (ll. 10-11). This concern is also presented as a manifestation of the natural behaviour of children towards a good father (ll. 14-17), which clearly aims to emphasise Hephaestion's and Origen's childlike *ethos*. Furthermore, their gratitude for being taken to Alexandria (ll. 3-5) is allusive to their young age as well as their dependence upon their father. In essence, the man who composed P.Ryl. 624, be he Besodorus or the anonymous scribe, appears to have applied the rules of *ethopoeia/prosopopoeia*, the use of which in letter-writing was recommended by Theon of Alexandria and Nicholas of Myra in their *Progymnasmata* (Ch. II § 2.2.1 (I)), and was presumably taught in the rhetorical schools. The letter, a true 'essay on filial piety',¹ seems to have been written by a rhetorically well-trained individual. On the other hand, P.Herm. 6 and P.Ryl. 624 do not differ in their linguistic and stylistic performance. The implication is twofold. Firstly, the young age and the limited (or non-existent) education of Hephaestion and Origen were not regarded as stimuli to the use of more modest utterance; in other words, the rules of *ethopoeia* were not applied to language selection. Secondly, the motivations which led the writer to produce such a highly-refined letter as P.Herm. 6, may also have influenced his conduct while writing on behalf of Theophanes' sons. These motivations are difficult to determine because of the uncertainties about his identity and his exact relationship with Theophanes. Let us assume, for instance, that the composition of P.Herm. 6 is Besodorus' own work. If he was related to Theophanes by blood-ties, the letter would point to a favourable attitude to the use of artful language in familiar correspondence, and this attitude might also have influenced his linguistic and stylistic choices in P.Ryl. 624. But if he was a mere acquaintance of Theophanes, he might have avoided informal utterance: hence the use of highly de-automatised language and style in P.Herm. 6. Similar motivations might have played a role if it was Besodorus' hired scribe who composed the letters. In that case, not only P.Ryl. 624 but also P.Herm. 6 would represent a mere exercise in epistolary composition, free of spontaneity and intimate involvement. As a result, we cannot safely assume that ^{either} of the two letters

¹ So Roberts, *P.Ryl.* IV (1952) p. 114.

is representative of the composer's normal attitude to language selection in familiar correspondence.

1.3.4.3. Both letters belonging to Group 3 were penned in an elegant literary script ¹ by one and the same professional scribe on behalf of people who refer to Theophanes as 'brother'. The senders of P.Herm. 4 seem to have belonged to a religious community, probably Christian,² whereas Hermodorus, the sender of P.Herm. 5, possibly a Christian himself,³ seems to have been the brother-in-law of Theophanes.⁴ In neither letter did the senders write the farewell in their own hand. They might have refrained from spoiling the literary appearance of the manuscripts, or they may have been illiterate. The latter hypothesis is supported by two arguments: (i) the fact that different people agreed not only on choosing one and the same scribe, but also on abstaining from appending their farewell would be a remarkable coincidence; (ii) as an autograph salutation was regarded as a sign of personal attention in Graeco-Roman antiquity (Ch. I § 3.2.2.1 (ii)), deliberate avoidance of this practice in letters which clearly aimed to communicate intimate thoughts would represent a surprising choice. Furthermore, the phraseological analogy between P.Herm. 4.4-6 and P.Herm. 5.3-4 corroborates the conclusion that the two letters were composed by the same individual. This man may have been the scribe himself.

P.Herm. 4 is a brief letter of salutation, in which John and Leon wish Theophanes a safe return. It is written well and fluently, which suggests that the writer was well-educated and was capable of handling the stylistic resources of Greek. But unlike the composer of P.Herm. 6 and P.Ryl. 624, he made no attempt either to enrich subject-matter with philosophical reflections or to make the language more distinctly literary by introducing ingredients characteristic of high level Greek. The same treatment of subject-matter is found in P.Herm. 5, but its style is more ambitious, although affectation was clearly avoided. The letter is characterised by elegant periods, in which subordination with finite verbs and participles is extensively used. Yet both the order of clauses and the order of words within the clause are natural. In the construction of sentences, the writer's desire for elegance seems to have caused the repeated use of correlatives to co-ordinate elements which casual prose would normally have connected with simple καί: cf. 14 ψυχῇ τε καὶ σώματι, 16-17 Ἀνυσίῳ τε καὶ

¹ App. (A) I 23. P.Herm. 5 also displays several lectional signs: see App. (A) II 12.

² So Naldini 1998, 181-182; Moscadi 1970, 130; E.A. Judge - S.R. Pickering, *JbAC* 20 (1977) 54; Bagnall 1993, 272 n. 78.

³ Cf. Moscadi 1970, 133. The hypothesis has recently been accepted by Bagnall 1993, 272 n. 78.

⁴ Cf. G. Bastianini, *Anagennesis* 3 (1983) 161-165.

Ἀφθονίωι, 18-19 τῶν πραγμάτων ὁμοῦ καὶ τῶν λειτουργημάτων.¹ Coupling of synonyms occurs at ll. 11-12 εὐχόμεθα καὶ ἐλπίζομεν, which could be paralleled from P.Ryl. 624. 30-31 (cf. § 1.3.4.2 above). The letter also exhibits elements characteristic of premeditated language behaviour. The writer undertook puristic self-censorship, although the exact puristic profile of the letter cannot be determined with certainty (Ch. III § 1.3.3 II B). The use of a choice word such as θυμηδία 'rejoicing' (l. 7) instead of commoner synonyms such as ἡδονή and χαρά is a further marker of stylistic pretension.²

Although P.Herm. 5 is stylistically more refined than average private letters, its level of rhetorical elaboration seems less high than that apparent in the items belonging to Group 2. The writer was clearly unfavourable to the use of rhetorical refinement in familiar correspondence. At the same time, the existence of different forms of linguistic behaviour in letters addressed to one and the same individual suggests that the personality of the recipient (Theophanes) exerted little influence on language selection.

1.3.4.4. The evidence on Theophanes himself is disappointingly meagre. It is regrettable that his letters (Group 4), which are addressed to his sons,³ are in such a bad state of preservation that little or no information on Theophanes' epistolary prose style can be derived from them. Of P.Ryl. IV 626 only a tiny scrap has survived. P.Ryl. IV 625 is in slightly better condition, but no continuous sense can be reconstructed except for the beginning. The letter seems to have dealt with practical matters, about which Theophanes gave directions to his son in a jussive style (cf. ll. 7 and 10). In the surviving portion of text, the gaps prevent the assessment of the language, especially of the treatment of indirect speech at ll. 5-6.⁴ As far as we can tell, the text reads fluently, but the construction of sentences exhibits no indicators of artificial composition. All in all, the beginning of the letter would seem fairly ordinary not only in the treatment of subject-matter but also in style. Theophanes' performance thus seems to differ considerably from that of the people who wrote on behalf of his correspondents, be they

¹ On this stylistic function of τε see e.g. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 464.

² On θυμηδία cf. LSJ s.v.; Moscadi 1970, 113. I cannot agree with Moscadi's assessment of other lexemes. For instance, the verb εὐφραίνω (l. 2), which he regarded as 'di uso poetico', is in fact very common in Koine prose of all periods and stylistic registers: cf. e.g. the materials collected by Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v.

³ Moscadi's reading υἱ[ῶν] in P.Ryl. IV 626.2 (Ἡ[φαιστ *ed.pr.*) seems correct. On the identity of Anysius, the addressee of P.Ryl. 625, see Moscadi 1970, 92 n. 2; CPR XVII A (1991), p. 49 (no. 18).

⁴ In view of the syntax, I prefer articulating λέγον (l. -ων) τα[] γίνεσθαι. Moscadi prints λέγοντα[.

Chapter Four

members of his family or not. The significance of this fact is difficult to determine with certainty. *Ipsissima verba* delivered by Theophanes in front of the strategus are probably recorded in CPR XVII A 12 (ll. 3-8, 10-11). They are characterised by a fluent Greek and by a moderate level of puristic refinement.¹ This suggests that the unpretentious style of his familiar letter presupposes a decision to avoid formal utterances. We do not know, however, whether Theophanes changed the style of performance in the lost part of the papyrus or not. Nor is it possible to tell whether he altered his linguistic behaviour in other private letters.

¹ An optative oblique occurs at l. 3, but σήμερον was preferred to τήμερον at ¹5.

2. RHETORICAL THEORY AND EPISTOLARY PERFORMANCE

2.0. The very varied types of refined epistolary performance discussed in §§ 1.2 and 1.3 seem to reflect varying views on the style suitable for cultivated private correspondence. In essence, if their principal characteristics are placed within the context of Greek theories of the epistolary style (Ch. II § 2), three major results are obtained:

- A. While pointing to an equal ambition for stylistic respectability, the writers' chosen high-level ingredients differ in their degree of compliance with the precepts of *known* epistolary theorists antedating the fourth century AD. (It may be noted that none of the letters examined in this chapter is probably later than the first half of the fourth century.)
- B. The extent to which each letter conforms as a whole to those norms varies considerably.
- C. Compositional choices which appear to be inconsistent with them seem to reflect either good stylistic doctrines or sheer ignorance of rhetoric.

2.1. Of the papyrus letters discussed in §§ 1.2 and 1.3, only P.Herm. 4 and 5 exhibit remarkable conformity to the norms proposed by epistolary theorists, particularly by Demetrius in *On Style*. In terms of content, they could be described as expositions of simple subjects, free of the rhetorical and philosophical superstructure which Demetrius himself criticised (Ch. II § 2.1.1.1), and which other writers used in their correspondence in order to make the subject-matter more noble. Moreover, unlike these (§§ 2.2-2.3), but in line with Demetrius' stylistic views, the individual who wrote the Hermopolis letters also kept their stylistic tenor midway between the excessively artless and the exceedingly elaborate (§ 1.3.4.3). As we have seen, several devices were employed to distance their style from casual communication, but neither letter displays any of the tools which were normally used to enhance the level of rhetorical elaboration of performance and which, therefore, were condemned by Demetrius as unsuitable for epistolary correspondence: complex periods were avoided; no use was made of metaphorical meanings and rare vocabulary (with the exclusion of *θυμηδία* in P.Herm. 5); clauses and words within the clause were not arranged artificially; rhetorical embellishments such as figures of speech and extended metaphors were avoided.¹

¹ For Demetrius' views on these aspects see Ch. II §§ 2.1.1.2-2.1.1.4.

No equal degree of compliance with the stylistic norms proposed by pre-Byzantine epistolary theorists is found in other letters. Cases of agreement between theory and actual performance touch other aspects of composition. The lengthy thoughts on friendship in P.David 14 (§ 1.3.2) are excellent examples of φιλικαὶ φιλοφρονήσεις, the use of which in letter-writing was recommended by Demetrius (Ch. II § 2.1.1.5). The repeated adoption of proverbs by the man who composed P.Ryl. IV 624 and P.Herm. 6 (§ 1.3.4.2) complies with the advice not only of Demetrius (Ch. II § 2.1.1.5) but also of Gregory of Nazianzus (Ch. II § 2.1.4), who produced his essay on the epistolary style just a few decades after those letters. Following a commonplace requirement, the same individual also made a clear attempt to communicate the *ethos* of the senders.

2.2. The vast majority of the first- to fourth-century letters examined in §§ 1.2 and 1.3 exhibit linguistic and stylistic ingredients characteristic of higher level prose, the use of which in epistolary correspondence was explicitly or arguably proscribed by extant theorists before the fourth century. These items include:

- A. ample and complex periods, criticised by both Demetrius (Ch. II § 2.1.1.2) and Philostratus (Ch. II § 2.1.3);
- B. artificial orderings of words, presumably condemned by Demetrius (Ch. II § 2.1.1.3);
- C. rhetorical figures, proscribed by all theorists (Ch. II § 2.1.7 (E));
- D. similes and extended metaphors, presumably censured by Demetrius in view of his condemnation of G below (cf. Ch. II § 2.1.1.3);
- E. rhetorical preambles: like all other characteristics of oratory, it was presumably considered inappropriate to letter-writing;¹
- F. rare vocabulary, disapproved of by Demetrius (Ch. II § 2.1.1.3);
- G. metaphorical meanings of words, rejected by Demetrius (Ch. II § 2.1.1.3).

P.Mil.Vogl. I 24 of AD 117 displays a remarkable case of A (§ 1.2.1 B), two instances of D (§ 1.2.1 C,D), and a case of G (§ 1.2.1 C). P.Oxy. XXXI 2603 (late iii or iv AD) has a combination of D and E (§ 1.3.3). In the early fourth century, Anatolius borrowed (§ 1.3.4.1) A (consistently) and F (once: see no. 7) in P.Herm. 2, and also B in P.Herm. 3 (no. B). P.Herm. 6, dating from about the same time, exhibits (§ 1.3.4.2) A, a remarkable case of C (harsh hyperbaton), and possibly also F (no. 3); the latter is repeatedly borrowed in another letter composed by the same individual (P.Ryl. IV 624), see § 1.3.4.2 nos. II, III, V.

2.3. The key-problem is to determine the reasons for these disagreements.

¹ On the preamble in the rhetorical theories of oratory see Calboli Montefusco 1988, 1-32. On the opposition oratory/letter-writing in the doctrines of epistolary theorists see Ch. II § 2.1.7 (B).

In P.Mil.Vogl. I 24, in which insufficient linguistic competence seems to have affected performance (§ 1.2.1), the treatment of higher level items is likely to have diverged so frequently and so profoundly from contemporary epistolary theory on account of sheer ignorance of its requirements as well as of the norms of rhetoric in general. By contrast, no such explanation seems applicable to cultivated letters characterised by greater stylistic balance and by the presence of internal indicators which suggest that the writers were acquainted with rhetoric. In such cases, the problem is to determine whether the choices reflect accepted rhetorical doctrines of the epistolary style. In fact, there is evidence to show that even professional rhetors could be induced by rhetorical intentions of unclear nature to take incongruous stylistic choices with known epistolary theory on composing non-literary correspondence. Instructive evidence is found in a brief letter which Antoninus Pius sent to the Coroneans in AD 140 (IG VII 2870.4-9 = Oliver 1989 no. 115). Ll. 7-8 exhibit a sequence of three cola, characterised by homoeoteleuton and parallelism, as follows:

καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρός μου	δικαίως	μνησθέντες
καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀρχῆς	κατὰ τὸ προσήκον	ἐπησθημένοι
καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου	προθύμως	συνηδόμενοι

The careful use of Gorgian figures suggests that the text of the letter was the work of a professional rhetor (Caninius Celer ? ¹), but at the same time clashes with the stylistic recommendations of known epistolary theorists, who regarded those figures as rhetorical embellishments unsuitable for letters (Ch. II § 2.1.7 (E)). One of them, Philostratus, specifically condemned the use of σχήματα in imperial correspondence (Ch. II § 2.1.3). The rhetorical principle on which the man responsible for the letter of Pius based his compositional choice is unclear. Philostratus, who was averse to the use of pretentious style in letters, condemned figures of speech precisely as elements characteristic of ambitious utterance (Ch. II § 2.1.3). Perhaps this rhetor regarded instead ambitious style as appropriate to the dignity of the emperor and, therefore, worthy of adoption in letters composed on his behalf. This would not be an isolated case: Aspasius of Ravenna, the rhetor who served as an imperial secretary less than a century later (Ch. III § 1.3.5), is said to have adopted highly oratorical periods in imperial correspondence (Ch. II §§ 2.1.3, 2.1.6). A possible alternative explanation is that the writer's views on the stylistic value of Gorgian figures diverged from those of known epistolary theorists. In *Or.* 3.202, Aeschines wrote a tripartite period which shares several characteristics with the passage under examination:

¹ Cf. p. 174.

Chapter Four

ἐπὶ σαυτὸν καλεῖς,
ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους καλεῖς,
ἐπὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν καλεῖς.

This passage was very frequently cited by ancient rhetoricians.¹ According to Demetrius, the cumulative use of more than one figure of speech in this tripartite period produces forcefulness (*δεινότης*) (*De eloc.* 268), that is, precisely the sort of oratorical effect which he deemed unsuitable for letter-writing. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, on the other hand, regarded the same passage as exciting *ἡδονή*.² This concept has a variety of connotations in Dionysius,³ but is essentially related to the notion of elegance, which Demetrius himself regarded as a constituent of the epistolary style (Ch. II § 2.1.1). About two centuries after the letter of Pius, charm (*χάρις*), an element linked to the sphere of elegance in Demetrius' stylistics (Ch. II § 2.1.1.5), was still accepted by Gregory of Nazianzus as one of the principal goals of the ideal letter (Ch. II § 2.1.4). One thus wonders whether Gorgian figures struck the putative rhetor who wrote the letter of Pius as tools which allow the achievement of a traditional epistolary virtue such as elegance.

Similar attitudes may also account for ambitious stylistic choices found in some of the private letters examined in § 1.3. As we have seen, the man who wrote P.Ryl. IV 624 and P.Herm. 6 was a rhetorically well-trained individual, who seems to have complied with certain of the accepted rhetorical rules of epistolary composition (§§ 1.3.4.2, 2.1). His frequent use of stylistic elements proscribed by known pre-Byzantine epistolary theorists (i.e. ample periods, rhetorical figures, rare vocabulary) may originate from an inclination to share recognised tenets concerning the epistolary style, of which no documentation has survived in extant treatises and essays on rhetoric and stylistics dating from contemporary and earlier times. Perhaps he was favourable to the adoption of elements of the oratorical style in private correspondence, in line with precise attitudes documented by the later epistolary practice (Ch. II § 2.1.6). Similar considerations might apply to his contemporary (and acquaintance ?) Anatolius. In fact, the compiler of the manual of Pseudo-Libanius recommended the use of a mild degree of elegance and stylistic refinement in letter-writing (Ch. II § 2.1.5 B), but his precepts are too superficial to allow a firm comparison with those letters to be carried out. In

¹ Cf. F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, III 2 2nd ed. (Leipzig 1898) 239 n. 1; Id., *Aeschinis Orationes*, 2nd ed. (BT, Leipzig 1908) 264; M.R. Dilts, *Aeschinis Orationes* (BT, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997) 292.

² *De comp. verb.* 9.49, p. 34. 7-15 Us.-Rad. (= p. 154. 19-26 Us.-Rad.). Cf. Kindstrand 1982, 37.

³ See the bibliography cited by Kindstrand 1982, 37 n. 81.

other words, it is hard to tell whether and to what extent Anatolius and the composer of P.Ryl. 624 and P.Herm. 6 anticipate stylistic views which were later canonised by Pseudo-Libanius.

Greater problems are raised by the use of the long, metaphorical preamble in P.Oxy. XXXI 2603, since it displays several elements of abnormality for which I cannot offer any convincing justification. In terms of content, it consists precisely of the sort of philosophical disquisition which was censured by Demetrius (Ch. II § 2.1.1.1). As regards form, the extended metaphor contributes an unusually marked rhetorical effect; the stylistically refined preface in P.David 14 (§ 1.3.2) seems less pretentious in virtue of the absence of metaphors and other figures. Borrowing the Greek terminology adopted by Consultus Fortunatianus, a rhetorician approximately contemporary with P.Oxy. 2603,¹ we could define its preamble an ἐσχηματισμένον προοίμιον.² Fortunatianus and other rhetoricians regarded the use of figures of speech (including metaphors) in oratorical proems as a *vitium*; they differ in propounding full condemnation or restrictions on it.³ Paul, the outstanding ecclesiastic who wrote the letter, evidently wanted to produce a highly rhetorical letter. But his compositional choices seem very odd even in the light of rhetorical theory of oratory.

2.4. As we have seen, theorists called attention to the existence of a variety of determinants of epistolary composition (Ch. II § 2.2.1). Letters belonging to the archive of Theophanes, which were all written by well-educated individuals perfectly capable of handling the stylistic resources of literary Greek (§ 1.3.4) as well as of complying with the rules of rhetoric (§ 2.3), show that writers did not regulate every aspect of composition according to the same parameters. In P.Ryl. IV 624, the personality of the sender inspired the choice of the main motifs, but apparently did not influence the selection of the level of linguistic and stylistic refinement (§ 1.3.4.2). Similarly, neither Anatolius nor the man who composed P.Herm. 4 and 5 seem to have adapted the language to their recipients (§§ 1.3.4.1, 1.3.4.3), although at least the former appears on one occasion to have introduced a particular proverbial expression in order to please his correspondent. Evidently, unlike phraseology, tone, and themes, the choice of the stylistic register was not necessarily dependent on external factors. This fact probably explains why theorists devoted little or no attention to the description and the illustration of stylistic and linguistic variations, but generally focused on the tonal and

¹ Fortunatianus is usually dated to the fourth century, see Calboli Montefusco 1979, 4-5.

² Cf. Cons. Fort. *Ars rhet.* 2.15, p. 120. 20 Calb. Montef. On the problematic origin of this terminology see Calboli Montefusco 1988, 26-27.

³ Cf. Calboli Montefusco 1979, 373 & 1988, 27.

Chapter Four

phraseological ones (Ch. II § 2.2.2). Their occasional remarks on the language and style proper appear insufficiently detailed to represent the complexity of actual practice. For instance, notwithstanding their recommendations to use a more elevated style in official letters (Ch. II § 2.2.2), there is evidence to show that educated individuals could and did integrate substantial quantities of elements of higher level Greek into familiar correspondence,¹ and that rhetorically well-trained men could adopt an ambitious style even when writing familiar letters on behalf of illiterate people.² Similarly, there seems to have been no necessary correlation between style and subject-matter, because sources not only document cases of writers wishing to dignify the style of simple letters of salutation addressed to far-away friends and relatives,³ but also of letters dealing with practical matters such as the dispatch of items, requests for help, and personal recommendations of individuals.⁴

¹ Cf. P.Oxy. VII 1070 (§ 1.1.1) and P.Mil.Vogl. I 24 (§ 1.2.1).

² Cf. P.Ryl. IV 624 (§ 1.3.4.2) and P.Herm. 5 (§ 1.3.4.3).

³ Cf. P.Ryl. IV 624 & P.Herm. 6 (§ 1.3.4.2), P.Herm. 5 (§ 1.3.4.3), and the three letters of Anatolius (§ 1.3.4.1).

⁴ Cf. P.Mil.Vogl. I 11 (§ 1.3.1), P.David 14 (§ 1.3.2), P.Oxy. XXXI 2603 (§ 1.3.3).

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

The present thesis with its in-depth discussion of the reception of higher level Greek in the second- to sixth-century non-literary papyri has attempted to shed light on several aspects of the phenomenon of language cultivation in a specific area of the Roman Empire, which - speculative remarks apart - have hitherto remained unexplored. In particular, major elements of progress on current scholarship include: (1) a first classification of the main typologies of stylistic refinement, on the basis of which the place of many linguistic and stylistic variants within the contemporary system has been defined; (2) improved understanding of the relationship between competence and performance; (3) an illustration of the principal mechanisms of style selection.

A TYPOLOGY OF STYLISTIC REFINEMENT

The use of elements of high level Greek is characteristic of prose classifiable within the high and middle registers of style. As we have seen, the precise degree of stylistic refinement of non-literary performance depends mainly on:

- (A) the number and variety of high level ingredients adopted;
- (B) the degree of consistency to which elements of each stylistic category were used;
- (C) the level of interaction between different ingredients;
- (D) the extent to which lower level features were integrated.

The essential elements, however, are A, C, and D, since the efficacy of B as a criterion of assessment is often undermined by the limited length of the non-literary papyri. By manipulating these elements, writers could obtain their desired level of refinement. The top level consists of items displaying high A, C, and possibly also B versus no D: certain of the fourth-century letters examined in Chapter Four represent good illustrations of this typology. Within it, however, further distinctions can be drawn: items characterised by highly puristic profiles and by great attention to classicising Greek (e.g. P.Herm. 2) rank higher than texts displaying a lower impact of purism (e.g. P.Ryl. IV 624).

The middle register includes widely varied degrees of refinement, depending upon not only the level of relaxation in A-C, but also the degree of receptivity to lower level features (D). For instance, some of the letters examined in Chapter Four, which can be classified within the middle register, differ in their typology, thus:

- (i) no C but high D (though combined with varying attitudes to A);
- (ii) low C;
- (iii) very limited A.

As we have seen, whilst (ii) may indicate that the writer simply wanted to confine refinement to particular contexts, the implications of (i) vary according to the writers' precise attitude to A: the use of a large number and variety of high level ingredients

Conclusion

points to unsuccessful attempts at achieving higher registers. (iii) also includes widely varied types of performance, depending upon the degree of erudition and desuetude inherent in the high level ingredient(s) adopted as well as upon the fluency of performance. Even extremes (i.e., isolated cases of learned language in the midst of carelessly-composed sentences) are attested. In fact, I hope to have demonstrated that language cultivation was not necessarily a function of premeditated language behaviour in Graeco-Roman Egypt: as shown in Chapter Three, the level of puristic intensity of language was in some papyri a function of the degree of stylistic refinement of performance outside the realm of purism, but was totally unrelated to it in other circumstances.

AWARENESS, AMBITION, COMPETENCE, AND PERFORMANCE

The evidence discussed in this thesis demonstrates that in second- to sixth-century Egypt, just as in modern societies, there was no necessary correlation between awareness of style, ambition for stylistic refinement, and skill in handling the resources of high level registers. The use of a pretentious style posits awareness of registers, but as expected, neither sense of language and style nor competence necessarily gave rise to ambitious performance.¹ The reception of features of high level Greek in written prose was entirely a matter of choice, which could be made either deliberately or unconsciously (see below); thus, educated individuals could or could not decide for it. Similarly, private letters examined in Chapter Four show that neither awareness of stylistic registers nor ambition for refinement were necessarily accompanied by successful accomplishment of one's own purpose. As shown in Chapter Two, schooling provided an introduction to 'correct' Greek, but did not always guarantee the acquisition of adequate competence.

CONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS: THE PSYCHOLOGY AND THE DETERMINANTS OF STYLE SELECTION

Not only the use of stylistic refinement as a whole, but also the reception of individual high-level ingredients represent complex phenomena which were governed by a variety of factors. The evidence discussed in this thesis is threefold. It partly illustrates the action of well-known determinants of style selection, partly sheds light on largely neglected phenomena, partly reveals situations which our inadequate interpretative instruments are unable to elucidate. It also shows that the use of (elements of) stylistic refinement in each individual source was generally the outcome of the interaction of

¹ This is shown by the use of unsophisticated utterance in letters which display evidence of linguistic competence: cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 nos. 1-3,5.

Conclusion

different factors, amongst which a prominent position is taken by the general attitudes of writers to the reception of cultivated performance in everyday prose, their accepted norms of good usage, and the concomitant impulse of contingent causes.

(A) *Functional Styles*

Anticipating acquisitions of modern stylistics, the ancients connected style with the function of the message which the writer wanted to convey, as well as with the audience at which the message was directed. As we saw in Chapter Two, epistolary theorists recommended adapting the tone and (to a lesser extent) the style of letters to subject-matter, recipients, and the particular settings; and the normal rhetorical training in epistolary composition seems to have included exercises aimed specifically at developing the skill in modulating compositional choices in relation to those factors. Actual epistolary practice, however, provides contradictory evidence with respect to the nexus between style and the function of message. I hope to have demonstrated in Chapter Four that rhetorically well-trained individuals used an ambitious style in private correspondence dealing with practical matters. On occasions, even within the same letter characterised by different concentrations of higher level ingredients only some of these nuclei appear to be correlated with subject. Other genres do not diverge from letter-writing: for instance, only certain of the poetic loans employed by a sixth-century educated individual such as Dioscorus of Aphroditon in his documents and petitions was inspired by context.

Similarly, the personality of recipients did not necessarily affect style selection. As shown in Chapter Three, the high rank of recipients may have represented a stimulus to the reception of highly puristic variants in many petitions, and occasionally also in letters addressed by private citizens to officials, but it did not equally affect the choice of the puristic profiles in letters dispatched by high-ranking officials. Even in petitions, it did not exert an equal influence on performance outside the realm of purism. Chapter Four reveals that even in private letters written by well-educated individuals the personality of recipients affected the choice of motifs and phraseology, but not the selection of style and language proper. In particular, there is no secure instance of a private letter in which the recipient can be shown to have influenced the writer's puristic conduct. Moreover, not only insufficiently-educated people but also rhetorically well-trained individuals could and did integrate substantial quantities of elements of higher level Greek into familiar correspondence. Evidently, incompetence cannot explain every divergence between actual performance and the doctrines of theorists. Evidence clearly suggests not only that non-literary prose composition was the outcome of the interaction of different motivations, but also that language cultivation could be independent of external factors.

Conclusion

(B) The Role of Psychological Factors

As we have seen, private documents rich in formulae, in which language selection is unlikely to have been influenced by external determinants such as subject and genre, provide evidence of the role played by the writers' own psychological motivations. *Divertissement*, for instance, seems to account for a number of cases of integration of poetic loans into contracts and purely administrative registers (Ch. III § 2.3.2), and self-satisfaction may have been at the root of linguistic behaviour of individuals who were particularly inclined to adopt high-level language varieties in documents (cf. Ch. III § 2.3.1). One thus wonders how far these motivations affected the reception of single high-level items (or even specific concentrations of them) in prose texts which were freer from the constraint of formulae. Unfortunately, the nature of evidence does not allow us to answer the question.

(C) The Role of Instinct and of Personal Usage

Occasionally, language cultivation was also associated with unplanned linguistic behaviour. The phenomenon of unconscious puristic self-censorship, to which I frequently referred in Chapter Three, probably represents the clearest indication of the role played by instinct in the reception of higher-level linguistic ingredients in non-literary prose. The non-relaxation of puristic strictures in exceedingly casual performance and the occasional use of high-profile puristic variants in receipts and contracts are exemplary manifestations of that phenomenon. In such cases, the censorship was probably undertaken under the influence of writing, but the attitude of writers to cultivated performance may have represented an additional stimulus on occasions. In fact, save the concomitant influence of contingent causes, personal inclination can be shown to have played a role not only in the use of stylistic refinement as a whole, but also in the reception of single high-level features. As suggested in Chapter Three, the frequent use of poetic loans by Dioscorus of Aphroditto, a man who undertook puristic self-censorship in documents, is likely to have been primarily dependent on his interest in poetry, although psychological stimuli may have inspired individual choices. In the same way, well-educated individuals who consistently adopted an ambitious style in their private letters irrespective of recipients (Ch. IV §§ 1.3.4.1-1.3.4.2) may have been inclined to keep the stylistic level of their written performance well above casual utterance.

(D) The Role of Genre

Rhetorical prescriptions on the style of each genre also affected style selection, but the real extent of their influence is difficult to determine, since it is generally impossible to distinguish their contribution from that of factors examined above. There are further difficulties. Firstly, it is hard to tell to what extent the non-use of proscribed stylistic

Conclusion

devices in written usage reflects a specific desire to comply with prohibitory norms. Secondly, as rhetorical precepts concerning the style of the different (non-)literary forms were subject to changes, we cannot determine the writers' accepted norms of good usage. Evidence of the influence of rhetoric, however, can be detected in favourable conditions. As suggested in Chapter Three, a desire to comply with the prescriptions of Atticists probably accounts for the use of very high puristic profiles in forensic oratory of the second/third century AD. Similarly, the use of moderate profiles in letters by well-educated individuals may stem from an inclination to respect norms favouring the use of mildly Atticising Greek in letter-writing. More generally, I showed in Chapter Four that in a number of refined private letters not only the overall stylistic configuration of performance, but also specific compositional choices can occasionally be suspected of reflecting good rhetorical views, although not all of them happen to comply with norms proposed by known epistolary theorists.

CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS AND INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR

Only on rare occasions can we examine the continuity and change in the attitude of single individuals to high level Greek. Where that is possible, the available evidence suggests the existence of widely varied lines of conduct, but is generally insufficient to enable us to elucidate many crucial aspects. I showed in Chapter Four that certain individuals were inclined to adopt high level styles of fairly homogeneous characteristics in letters written approximately at the same time and centred upon similar subjects: to what extent such consistency was retained in other circumstances we cannot tell. By contrast, I pointed out the possibility that the decision of one other individual to adopt a very pretentious style in a familiar letter was in sharp contrast to his own behaviour in similar circumstances; there is no telling how far his use of ambitious Greek was an isolated choice.

Given the complex mechanisms which regulated style selection as well as the classicising connotation of the Greek perception of good linguistic usage, establishing the stylistic peculiarities of various periods is even more difficult than distinguishing individual styles. I have shown, however, that the choice of specific linguistic variants often reflected contemporary literary usage.

APPENDICES

(A) BOOKHANDS AND LECTIONAL SIGNS IN PRIVATE LETTERS**I. A SELECT LIST OF PAPYRUS LETTERS WRITTEN IN LITERARY HANDS
(Late i to vi AD)**

I include examples of bookhands proper, of both formal and informal character, and a few instances of slowly-written documentary scripts which exhibit influences of literary hands. For other materials see M.S. Funghi, in Ead. (ed.), *ΟΔΟΙ ΔΙΖΗΣΙΟΣ. Le vie della ricerca. Studi in onore di Francesco Adorno* (Florence 1996) 15 n. 9; Cribiore 1996, 100 n. 21; cf. also *GBEBP* p. 1. For the notion of 'bookhand' see esp. *GMAW*² pp. 1-4; cf. also H.Hunger, in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, I (Zurich 1961) 77; G. Cavallo, *BICS* 19 (1972) 131.

1. P.Fay. 110¹ (AD 94): *ed.pr.* plate V; *GLH* 11b; Montevicchi 1988, pl. 44. Slowly-written bilinear round informal script;
2. SB XVI 12322 (i AD): *BASP* 16 (1979) pl. 4.
3. P.Mil.Vogl. I 11² (late i [Vogliano] or 1st half of ii AD [Linguisti, *CPF*]). The papyrus is apparently lost; the hand has been described by the editors as an elegant specimen of majuscule script;³
4. P.Giss.Univ. III 20 (written shortly after c. AD 114, see the editor's note on l. 4): *ed.pr.* plate I. Upright formal bookhand of mixed style (ε θ ο σ are narrow);
5. P.Oxy. LVIII 3917 (early ii AD): *ed.pr.* pl. II.
6. P.Oxy. XVIII 2192 (Pack² 2091) (c. AD 170): *GMAW*² 68. Round informal hand free of ligatures;⁴
7. P.Oxy. III 530 (ii AD);
8. P.Oxy. III 589 (ii AD). Good-sized upright round informal bookhand;
9. P.Amsterdam inv. 118, ed. P.J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 113 (1996) 165 (with pl.), ii AD;
10. P.Haun. II 14 + (?) 15 (ii AD): *ed.pr.* plates II & III. Slowly-written squarish informal bookhand;
11. P.Haun. II 27 (ii AD): *ed.pr.* plate XII. Round informal script;
12. P.Mert. II 80 (*ed.pr.* plate XXVIII) and III 114 (*ed.pr.* pl. III), both penned by one and the same hand (late ii AD): strictly bilinear round hand with most letters fitting into a square; it is a distant kin to 'Roman Uncial';⁵
13. P.David 14 = P.Stras. IV 169 + P.Ross.Georg. II 43 (ii rather than iii AD according to J. Schwartz): *P.L.Bat.* XVII plate VIII opposite p. 118. Slowly-

¹ White 1986 no. 95.

² *CPF* I 1* 6 = Pack² 2093.

³ Cf. *P.Mil.Vogl.* I (1937) p. 18 and *CPF* I 1* (1989) p. 110 (on the grounds of a photograph kept in Milan). They have not stated, however, what type of majuscule script it is.

⁴ For a discussion of the hand see *GMAW*² pp. 3, 114, 152 (no. 149), where refs. to literary MSS written in similar scripts will be found.

⁵ On this script see G.Cavallo, *ASNP* s. ii, 36 (1967) 209-220 with the remarks of *GMAW*² pp. 38 n.1 and 148 nos. 19-20. The script of P.Mert. 80 and 114 is much more informal and more relaxed; and such cursively-shaped letters as α υ, while being consistent with the informal character of the hand, are foreign to the normal 'Roman Uncial' canon.

written round informal bookhand;¹

14. P.Haun. II 16 (ii/iii AD): *ed.pr.* plate IV. Slowly-written informal script influenced by the 'Severe Style' class;
15. O. Flor. 15. The script belongs to or is heavily influenced by the 'Severe Style' class. This item is believed to be part of a very large group of ostraca assigned roughly to the mid-second century AD.² Such an early date for 'Severe Style' is remarkable. In fact, I am not so sure that we are really dealing with a single find, as all the ostraca were purchased from a single dealer. Moreover, they represent discarded material, and therefore may not be homogeneous in date.
16. P.Oxy. VI 936 (iii AD): formal 'mixed style' ('Severe Style') of sloping type;³
17. P.Berol. inv. 21702 (ined.) (iii AD): 'Severe Style' of sloping type;
18. P.Oxy. XIV 1767 (iii AD): 'Severe Style' of sloping type;
19. P.Oxy. XIV 1768 (iii AD): 'Severe Style' of sloping type;
20. P.Flor. II 259 (iii AD);
21. P.Ross.Georg. III 2 ⁴ (iii AD): *ed.pr.* plate 1; *GLH* 23c; Chapa 1998, pl. VII. Round informal bookhand of sloping type;
22. P.Oxy. XII 1592 ⁵ (late iii-early iv AD): strictly bilinear bold upright squarish ornamented bookhand having a few characteristics in common with 'Biblical Majuscule',⁶ thus:
 - (i) modulus: bilinearity is strictly respected; most of the letters (including the round ones) fit into equal-sized squares, μ extends in breadth;
 - (ii) shape and formation of letters: cf. especially μ (geometrical in four movements) and ξ ;
 - (iii) shading: the contrast between thick and thin strokes is broadly similar.

Differences include looped α , cursively-shaped υ which does not protrude below the notional baseline, curved right-hand vertical of μ , and descending oblique of α . There is an air of carelessness. Is P.Oxy. 1592 a true, yet relaxed and badly-executed (and possibly unprofessional), specimen of 'Biblical Majuscule' ? Or is it an imitation of calligraphic exemplars ?
23. P.Herm. 4 (*ed.pr.* plate III; Montevocchi 1988, pl. 87; *GBEBP* 2a) and P.Herm. 5 (*ed.pr.* pl. IV; *GMAW*² 70), both penned by one and the same hand (early iv AD): very tidy and formal bookhand of sloping type;⁷
24. P.Oxy. LVI 3858 (iv AD): *ed.pr.* plate VI. Bold sloping formal bookhand similar

¹ Here and there the scribe accelerated the speed of writing. For a discussion of the hand see J. Schwartz, *P.David* (1968) pp. 116-117: he described it as a 'main d'un professionnel de textes littéraires'.

² *O.Flor.* introd.; W. Clarysse, in *Atti XVII Congr. Int. Pap.*, III (Naples 1984) 1021; W. Clarysse - P.J. Sijpesteijn, *AncSoc* 19 (1988) 73, 96.

³ This script was used for writing a large number of literary MSS.

⁴ Hengstl 1978 no. 161 = Tibiletti 1979 no. 1 = Chapa 1998 no. 7.

⁵ Ghedini 1923 no. 14 = Naldini 1998 no. 31.

⁶ On this script see Cavallo 1967 (pp. 4-12 for a description of the canon) with the remarks of H.Hunger, *ByzZ* 62 (1969) 81-83, P.J. Parsons, *Gnomon* 42 (1970) 375-380, J. Irigoin, *Scriptorium* 24 (1970) 67-74; cf. also *GBEBP* p. 5 as well as Cavallo 1977, 106-107 (on later periods).

⁷ The hand is discussed in *GMAW*² p. 118, *GBEBP* pp. 4,10, and by Maehler 1990 (1984), 34-35.

Appendix (A)

- to no. 23 (so *ed.pr.*), but less regular and less attractive;
25. P.Oxy. XXXI 2603 ¹ ((early ?) iv AD Harrop, Turner; iii/iv Bastianini *ap.* Naldini 1998, 442): *JEA* 48 (1962) plate V. Slowly-written upright squarish informal bookhand;²
 26. P.Mert. II 93 (iv AD): *ed.pr.* plate XLI; *StudPap* 15 (1976) opposite 144; Montevecchi 1988, pl. 91. Sloping informal bookhand;³
 27. P.Berol. inv. 21952 (ined.) (v/vi AD);
 28. P.Dubl. 23 (v/vi AD): *ed.pr.* plate 20. Monumental specimen of 'Sloping Pointed Majuscule';⁴
 29. P.Oxy. LVI 3866 (2nd half (?) of the sixth century): *ed.pr.* plate VII. Carefully-written upright informal script giving the impression of following certain characteristics of Byzantine bookhands.⁵

II. A CONSOLIDATED LIST OF LETTERS DISPLAYING LECTIONAL SIGNS AND PUNCTUATION MARKS

Some examples are cited in *GMAW*² p. 118. On punctuation in private letters see Chapa 1998, 105.

1. P.David 14 (= P.Stras. IV 169 + P.Ross.Georg. II 43) (ii or iii AD):
 - 3 rough breathings (ll. 5,15,24);
 - 1 circumflex accent (l. 25);
2. P.Oxy. LIX 3992 (ii AD) (plate VIII):
 - 1 circumflex accent (l. 27);
3. P.Ross.Georg. V 4 (ii AD):
 - 13 medial stops used as word-separators (ll. 4,5 [2x], 6,7,8 [3x], 11 [3x], 13);
4. P.Oxy. I 122 (ii rather than late iii or iv AD, see Ch. IV § 1.2.2):
 - 3 rough breathings (ll. 4,8,12);

¹ *Ed.pr.*: Harrop 1962. Naldini 1998 no. 47.

² There are occasional lapses into more cursive writing, especially towards the end of the letter. Some letters (μ, ω; occasionally also α [cf. 19 και αγαπ] and ε [cf. 18 σε]) are reminiscent of 'mixed styles': cf. P.Oxy. III 406 (*ed.pr.* pl. I), assigned to the third century (μ, ω, partly also υ [l. 4] and α), and P.Oxy. I 15 (*S & C* 9 [1985] pl. 3a), doubtfully assigned to the fourth century (μ, ω). *GBEBP* 2b has also very similar alphas.

³ The hand was discussed by A. Leone, *StudPap* 15 (1976) 146-147.

⁴ This is a very poorly-preserved papyrus of uncertain content: its inclusion in the present list may not be correct. There are some indications that it is a letter addressed to a collective recipient (*ed.pr.* p. 124). But in that case, while not sufficient by itself to rule out a connection with the private sphere, the monumental character of the script rather points to other directions: a new 'literary' letter of a known epistolographer? A letter from a high-ranking ecclesiastic to a church, or from an imperial administrator to a municipal *koinon*? On 'Sloping Pointed Majuscule' see W. Lameere, *Aperçus de paléographie homérique* (Les publications de *Scriptorium* 4, Paris 1960) 177 ff.; Cavallo 1967, 118 ff.; Cavallo 1977, 98 ff.; Maehler 1990 (1984); *GBEBP* p. 4.

⁵ For an excellent description of the script see *ed. pr.* It resembles PSI I 16 (*GBEBP* 34c) (Isocrates).

Appendix (A)

5. P.Oxy. XLVII 3366 (= P.Coll.Youtie II 66), ll. 17-39 (text B) (AD 253-260; possibly AD 258 or 259, cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 4) (P.Coll.Youtie II plate XXII):
 - 2 rough breathings (ll. 31,32);¹
6. P.Ross.Georg. III 2 (cf. I 21) (iii AD):
 - 37 stops marking colon-ends ² (ll. 2,3,4 [2x], 5,6 [2x], 7 [2x], 8,9, 10 [2x], 11,12,13,14,15,16 [2x], 17,18,20,21,22,23 [2x], 24, 25 [2x], 26,27,28 [2x], 29, 30 [2x]);
7. P.Oxy. LV 3812 (late iii AD):
 - 2 rough breathings (ll. 6, 12 [?]);
 - 1 circumflex accent (l. 10 [?]);
 - 1 high stop (l. 11);
 - 1 oblique stroke for strong punctuation (l. 5);
 - 2 apostrophes used as diastolai (ll. 9,10);
8. P.Ryl. IV 606 (late iii AD):
 - 1 medial stop (l. 12);
9. P.Oxy. XIV 1680 (late iii / early iv AD):³
 - 1 high stop (l. 12);
10. P.Herm. 2 ⁴ (early iv AD), same hand as no. 11 (plate I):
 - 4 rough breathings (ll. 4,10,12,20);
11. P.Herm. 3 ⁵ (early iv AD), same hand as no. 10 (plate II):
 - 1 rough breathing (l. 5);
12. P.Herm. 5 ⁶ (early iv AD):
 - 2 rough breathings (ll. 8,11);
 - 1 acute accent (l. 15);
 - 1 circumflex (l. 8);
 - 3 high stops (ll. 8,11,15);
13. P.Herm. 6 ⁷ (early iv AD), same hand as no. 14 (plate V):
 - 13 rough breathings (ll. 3,4,6,8,11,12,15,17,18 [3x],20,24);
 - 6 acute accents (ll. 8,14 [2x],17,27,28);
 - 6 circumflex accents (ll. 7,9 [2x],20,24,29);
 - 4 graves (ll. 10 [3x],16);
 - 11 high stops (ll. 6,8,11,12,13 [2x],15,18,22,23,26);
14. P.Ryl. IV 624 ⁸ (early iv AD), same hand as no. 13 (plate VI):
 - 2 smooth breathings (ll. 3,8);
 - 7 rough breathings (ll. 5,11,16,17,27 [2x],29);
 - 5 acute accents (ll. 3,16,27 [2x],28);
 - 3 circumflex accents (ll. 3,10,17);

¹ Text A in the same roll (ll. 1-16; draft of a petition) displays 1 rough breathing at l. 8. The script is different from that of text B, but this does not necessarily indicate that texts A and B were written by two different scribes: cf. Parsons 1976, 412.

² 'It is not possible to determine whether the scribe made a distinction between high and middle stops' (Chapa 1998, 105).

³ Ghedini 1923 no. 15 = *Sel.Pap.* I 153 = Naldini 1998 no. 32.

⁴ Moscadi 1970 no. 7.

⁵ Moscadi 1970 no. 8.

⁶ Moscadi 1970 no. 10 = Tibiletti 1979 no. 27.

⁷ Moscadi 1970 no. 11.

⁸ Moscadi 1970 no. 4.

Appendix (A)

- 5 high stops (ll. 15,18,21,23,27);
- 15. P.Kell. G. I 63, 1st half of iv AD (plate 63):
 - 1 rough breathing (l. 14);
 - 7 high stops (ll. 9,11,24,30,34,35,36);
- 16. P.Kell. G. I 71 (mid iv AD) (plate 71):
 - 4 high stops (ll. 10,14,25,36);
- 17. P.Kell. G. I 72, mid iv AD (plate 72):
 - 2 rough breathings (ll. 21,47);
 - 2 high stops (ll. 28,33);
 - 4 medial stops (ll. 11,19,30,40¹);
- 18. P.Oxy. XXXI 2603² (for the date see I 25 above):
 - 1 longum (l. 13);
 - 7 high stops (ll. 7,9,12,16,17,19,25): all the strong sense pauses are marked with high stops;
 - 1 reference mark (l. 29);³
- 19. P.Dubl. 23 (v/vi AD):
 - 1 medial stop (fr. 2.6).

Concordances:

- rough breathings: nos. 1,4,5,7,10,11,12,13,14,15,17;
- smooth breathings: no. 14;
- acute accents: nos. 12,13,14;
- grave accents: no. 13;
- circumflex accents: nos. 1,2,7,12,13,14;
- oblique strokes as markers of strong punctuation: no. 7;
- high stops: nos. 7,9,12,13,14,15,16,17,18;
- medial stops: nos. 8,17 (?),19;
- stops as markers of colon-end: no. 6;
- stops as word-separators: no. 3;
- apostrophes as diastolai: no. 7;
- longa: no. 18;
- reference marks: no. 18.

III. A LIST OF LETTERS CHARACTERISED BY BOOKHANDS AND LECTIONAL SIGNS

(Concordances to Lists I & II)

- | | |
|----|--------------|
| 1. | I 13 = II 1 |
| 2. | I 21 = II 6 |
| 3. | I 23 = II 12 |
| 4. | I 25 = II 18 |
| 5. | I 28 = II 19 |

¹ They are printed as low stops in the *ed.pr.*'s apparatus, but to judge from the published plate they seem to have been placed in a middle position.

² *Ed.pr.* Harrop 1962. Re-edited by Naldini 1998 no. 47.

³ This sign, shaped $\cdot/$. (and not $/$ as in *edd.*), indicates an addendum (it refers to the phrase entered in the left-hand margin, ll. 34-35). On such marks in literary papyri see *GMAW*² p. 14.

(B) A SELECTION OF PAPYRUS LETTERS WRITTEN IN STANDARD AND LOWER LEVEL GREEK

1. This appendix provides bibliographic references to or a full discussion of the language and style of a chronologically-ordered selection of homogeneous groups of letters illustrating the various types of unpretentious performance which a variety of individuals adopted in their private correspondence in the late first to mid-fourth centuries AD. Many of the individuals and of the specific phenomena included in this appendix were variously dealt with in the course of previous chapters. I shall first focus on the letters composed by five late first- / early second-century individuals from Fayum with a view to emphasising the existence of personal styles within the wide and multifaceted realm of casual utterance in one and the same period and in one and the same geographical area (§§ 1.1-1.5). Then I shall consider a group of letters written by a late second-century businessman, since they are good illustrations of the regularity and variations to which one and the same type of casual epistolary performance of one and the same person was subject (§ 1.6). Finally, I shall discuss the letters of two individuals who lived in the mid-fourth century in order to show the existence of synchronical variations within lower registers of style in early Byzantine Egypt (§§ 1.7-1.8).

1.1. Owing to the survival of a large number of familiar letters we can form a precise idea of the normal epistolary style of Lucius Bellienus Gemellus, a veteran and farmer from Euhemeria (Fayum) who lived in the late first / early second century.¹ The published items, many of which are autograph manuscripts, are characterised by a uniformly unpretentious, graceless, and often involute Greek with many colloquial features and a sprinkling of errors. A line-by-line linguistic commentary on P.Fay. 110-120 is offered by Olsson 1925, 150-177.

1.2. Approximately in the same period, Claudius Terentianus, another individual from Fayum (Karanis), served in the *classis Augusta Alexandrina*. We still have several familiar letters of his, all of which were personally composed but not penned by himself (Ch. I § 3.1.3).² While being characterised by a consistent reception

¹ P.Fay. 110-120, 248-249, 252, 254-256, 259, 265-273. Unfortunately, we have mere descriptions of, or even no information at all on, a large number of these papyri. On Gemellus and his archive see the bibliography cited by Montevocchi 1988, 252 no. 29.

² P. Mich. VIII 476-481. We also have six Latin letters (*CEL* I 141-146) which Terentianus wrote in *sermo cotidianus*. Discussions of his Latin include: R. Calderini, *RIE* 84 (1951) 250-262; G.B. Pighi, *Lettere latine d' un soldato di Traiano* (P. Mich. 467-472) (Bologna

of elements of standard late Greek, Terentianus' casual epistolary performance seems stylistically more fluid than that of Gemellus.

1.3. By contrast, Tabetheus, a relative of Terentianus (§ 1.2), wrote her letter(s) (P. Mich. VIII 473 and perhaps 474) in a lower style than Terentianus did, as indicated by her frequent use of asyndeton and of linguistic elements characteristic of lower level non-literary prose. The following items, all of which occur in P. Mich. VIII 473, are instructive:

1. πῶς after a *verbum affectus* (χαίρω) (l. 4), vulgar and unclass., cf. Ljungvik 1926, 67 (on θαυμάζω). ὅτι, however, is used at l. 27 (see below). The use of the dat. of pers. (with or without prep.) with the supplementary participle, as sometimes in class. Greek (Kühner-Gerth II 53-54, Schwyzer II 393, LSJ s.v. χαίρω [I] 1), would be abnormal in casual non-literary Koine.
2. Final ἕως for ὥς with subj. (l. 4), a characteristic of unsophisticated prose, see Radermacher 1925, 195; Ljungvik 1926, 65-66; Ljungvik 1932, 43-46; Rydbeck 1967, 153.
3. Act. form of deponent vb. (l. 7 μέμφε), cf. Gignac II 326 and § 1.7 C no. 4 (with more bibl.).
4. εἰ (= εἶ) + ind. (l. 7), cf. Jannaris 1897 § 1987; Mayser II 1, pp. 284-285; Horn 1926, 66-67; M. Ghedini, *Aegyptus* 15 (1935) 234 ff.; Radermacher 1925, 200; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 372, 1a; Turner, *Syntax* 115-116; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. 2.
5. Incongruence in gender: masc. forms instead of fem. are used in participles referring to Tabetheus herself (ll. 12 καταβάντες, 12-13 εἰσελθόντες, 13 βλέψας, 17 μεριμνῶν: this represents a low level usage, cf. Jannaris 1897 § 1181b, and esp. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 136,3; Kapsomenakis 1938, 40 ff. (n. 2) (with more bibl.); Turner, *Syntax* 314-315, item (iii); Mandilaras 1973 § 877.
6. Incongruence in number: the sequence καταβάντες (12) ... εἰσελθόντες (12-13) ... βλέψας (13) ... οὐκ εὐδόκηκα displays a mixture of we- and I-forms as elsewhere in this letter (e.g. ll. 6-7): cf. esp. the close parallels cited by Mayser II 1, p. 42c (all Ptol.), one of which (P.Hib. I 44.4-5) is also recorded by Mandilaras 1973 § 878 (1).
7. Thematic form of δύναιμι (l. 9 εἰδυνόμην [l. ἡδ-] ¹), cf. Mandilaras 1973 § 101 (cf. §§ 96-100, 102), Gignac II 384-385.
8. εἶπα (l. 16), cf. Mandilaras 1973 §§ 29, 317(3); Gignac II 336-337.
9. 2nd pers. sing. of the aor. ind. act. in -ες (l. 17 ἔβλαψες), cf. § 1.5 A. ἔπεμψας, however, occurs at l. 4.
10. ὅτι *recitativum* (ll. 27, 28), cf. § 1.7 D no. 6.
11. εἰσοῦ (l. 31), cf. § 1.5 C no. 2.
12. ὅμοιος + gen. (l. 29), rare and often v.l. in class. Greek (LSJ s.v. B 2; Rydbeck 1967, 47) but more and more common in non-classicistic and unadorned post-class. prose, cf. Jannaris 1897 § 1357; Mayser II 2, p. 136.22; Tabachovitz 1946, 147-148; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 182,4 (similarly Turner, *Syntax* 216); Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich

1964); E. Campanile, *L' Italia dialettale* 34 (1971) 1 ff.; esp. J.N. Adams, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (P. Mich. VIII 467-472) (Manchester 1977); Id., *ZPE* 31 (1978) 135-137; *CEL* II pp. 131-181 (with more bibl.). It is debated whether Terentianus' mother language was Greek or Latin. His letters, unearthed at Karanis but penned at Alexandria or in neighbouring villages, date from the early second century; a dated reference to Terentianus may be SB VI 9636.9 (Kar.) of AD 136, cf. N. Lewis, *TAPhA* 90 (1959) esp. 142-143 (= Lewis 1995, 68-69).

¹ On the augment cf. Mandilaras 1973 § 246(1), Gignac II 230-231.

Appendix (B)

s.v. 2; Rydbeck 1967, 46-49, 178. Kühner-Gerth I 413 were unreasonably sceptical as to its existence before Aelian. It was wrongly suspected of a Lat. origin by Blass and Debrunner, see Tabachovitz 1946, cit.; Rydbeck 1967, 47.

Occasionally, however, Tabetheus chose, whether deliberately or unconsciously, linguistic elements characteristic of higher registers of style in preference to more colloquial variants:

- i. inf. after a *verbum dicendi* (εἰπεῖν) denoting a command (ll. 15-16) where strongly colloquial prose would use ἵνα + subj., cf. § 1.4 A no. 3.
- ii. ἦ- augment, not ἐ-, in δύναιμι (l. 9) in compliance with the puristic requirements of Atticism (cf. Moer. 198.1-2 Bekker).
- iii. χαίρω with ὅτι (l. 27) as in class. (Kühner-Gerth II 355, LSJ *s.v.* χαίρω [I] 4) and post-class. Greek of different registers (Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich *s.v.* 1).

1.4. In the same period, the population of another village of Fayum (Tebtynis) included a man called Patron († AD 108), who was a member of a Greek family of farmers which ranked high in the social scale.¹ His extant familiar letters on business matters,² all of which are autograph manuscripts, exhibit the use of simple sentence structure and a post-class. informal language with a sprinkling of vulgar features.

A. *P.Mil.Vogl. II 50*

(a) Grammar:

1. Anacoluthon occurs at l. 3 τὰ ἔργα τὰ παρά σοι μηδὲ ἐν ἀμελείσθω(ι) (for τῶν ἔργων τῶν . . .). Perhaps Patron deemed it convenient to introduce a negation strengthening the individuality of the subj. ('not a single one'), regardless of the original construction, which would have required μή. The substantive at the head of the clause thus becomes a *nominativus pendens*.
2. Pres. for fut. (ll. 4 αὔριον κατέρχ(ομαι), 10 αὔριον ἀπαρτίζεται), a colloquial usage, cf. § 1.7 A no. 5.
3. ἵνα + subj. after a *verbum dicendi* (εἰπεῖν) denoting a command (ll. 10-11). Unclass., it is found in unpretentious prose of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Ptol. pap.: Mayser II 1, p. 243 and II 3, p. 51.33; Aalto 1953, 100; LXX: Turner, *Syntax* 104; NT: Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 392, 1d; Turner, *Syntax* 103; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich *s.v.* εἰπὼν 3c. The alternative construction, the (acc. and) inf., is normal in class. Greek

¹ This Patron is Patron I, on whom see particularly W. Bagnall 1974, 24-28. For the date of his death see *P.Mil.Vogl. I 23* + *P.Mil.Vogl. IV 209*; his letters to his father Laches were presumably written in the final decade(s) of the first century, cf. M. Vandoni, *Acme* 13 (1960) 249, Ead., *P.Mil.Vogl. II* (1961) p. 57. On the findspot of Patron's papers see Gallazzi 1990, esp. 286-287. For the family tree see *P.Mil.Vogl. II* (1961), p. 59 with the successive modifications by Foraboschi 1968, 54; C. Gallazzi, *P.Mil.Vogl. VI* (1977) pp. 29-30, 39-40; D. Foraboschi, *P.Rain.Cent.* (1983) pp. 103-105. The family had a gymnasiarchal rank (*P.Mil.Vogl. I 25* col. ii 4), although the status of gymnasiarch is attested only for Patron I's descendants (Foraboschi 1968, 54 n. 14). Additionally, Patron I's grand-son was a member of the high-ranking, yet much-debated, class of the '6475 Arsinoites Greeks' (Foraboschi, *P.Rain.Cent.* p. 105). For a general study of this family's activities see W. Bagnall 1974, esp. 104 ff.

² *P.Mil.Vogl. II 50-51*, *IV 218* (= SB VIII 9646), *VI 279* (= SB VI 9483), *SB VIII 9643-9645*.

Appendix (B)

(Kühner-Gerth II 6-7) and in Atticising Koine, but is not absent from lower level post-class. prose either (Mayser II 3, p. 42.37; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, cit.; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, cit.; Hult 1990, 235. Found even in colloquial letters, cf. § 1.3 (i)). More generally, on ἵνα after vbs. denoting a command, a desire, a request, a recommendation, and the like, see Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5 II.

(b) Vocabulary:

- i. κτάμιον 'pasture land' (l. 9), a strictly local word, cf. H.C. Youtie, *ZPE* 15 (1974) 147-148 = Youtie 1981, I 153-154; M. Vandoni, *P.Mil.Vogl.* VI (1977) p. 25.
- ii. ὀρθρίζω (l. 13).

B. *P.Mil.Vogl.* II 51

βοτανισμός 'weeding' (l. 16), a late lexeme.

C. *P.Mil.Vogl.* IV 218

1. the dual is not used, see ll. 2,3.
2. διὰ προτέρου καταπλέοντος 'the first one to sail downwards' (l. 6) with anarthrous substantivised participle (πρότερου is used adverbially), cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 413, 1. It is rare in class. Greek (Kühner-Gerth I 608-609); contrast esp. Thuc. 1.123.2 οἱ πρότεροι ἐπιόντες.
3. δίδω(ι) instead of δίδωμι (l. 8). This is a vulgar feature, cf. Mandilaras 1973 § 87, Gignac II 382.

D. *P.Mil.Vogl.* VI 279

(a) Grammar:

μυμνήσκω with dat. of pers. and ἵνα + subj. denoting a command (ll. 9-11), cf. the Ptol. exx. cited by Mayser II 1, p. 243; Mandilaras 1973 § 584 no. (8); cf. *ibid.* § 594. Such use of ἵνα is characteristic of Patron's informal Greek, see A (a) no. 3 above. A parallel post-class. constr. is ὅπως + subj., cf. § 1.8 A no. 1. The inf. is mainly class. (Kühner-Gerth II 70 no. 10, LSJ s.v. [I] 2).

(b) Post-class. Vocabulary:

1. κοίτη 'stall, pen' (l. 3), cf. M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hell. Ägypten*, I (Münch. Beitr. z. Pap.-forsch. u. ant. Rechtsgesch. 7, Munich 1925) 349 n. 1.
2. χορτάριον (l. 5).
3. ὀλίζω (l. 12).
4. ὀλιστάριον (l. 13) (Π^{PC}: κεράμιν (l. -μιν) Π^{AC}).¹
5. Preference for composite vbs. where class. Greek would use simples: cf. διενοχλέω for ἐνοχλ. (l. 7) ² and ἐγκατέρχομαι for κατερχ. (ll. 10-11).³ It is a characteristic of Koine, cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 116,1.

E. *SB VIII* 9643

In ἐγραψα . . . τῶν τρυγῶν (l. 9), Patron may either have used the simple gen. instead of περί/ὑπέρ + gen., or may have inadvertently omitted the preposition.

¹ Note that the correction introduces the repetition ὀλιστον . . . ὀλιστάριον.

² Here δια- retains its normal perfectivising force (Moulton-Howard 300 ff.).

³ ἐν- is not used properly, since ἐν was rarely employed in Koine to form compounds (Moulton-Howard 304), and the normal distinctive force of ἐν- (Moulton-Howard 305 ff.) seems inapplicable to the present case. It stands for εἰς- ('come down into' LSJ Rev. Suppl. s.v.): for the Koine use of ἐν instead of εἰς cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ἐν I 6; Jannaris 1897 § 1565; Humbert 1930, 58-59; E. Oldenburger, *De oraculorum Sibyllinorum elocutione* (Diss. Rostock 1903) 26; Johannessohn 1926, 330 ff.; Mayser II 2, pp. 372-373; Zilliacus 1943, 41-42; Radermacher 1925, 140, 145; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 218; Turner, *Syntax* 257.

Appendix (B)

F. SB VIII 9645

The dual is not used, see l. 3 [τῶν δύο κλήρω].

Post-class. vocabulary:

1. ὑποδόχιον (l. 3).
2. ποτισμός 'irrigation' (?) (l. 6).
3. μυρισμός (l. 6) (unclear meaning).

1.5. Among the surviving documents which illustrate the activities of the family are also three or possibly four autograph letters of Geminus († AD 127), the son of Patron I.¹ Three of them closely resemble his father's letters in content and style.

A. P.Mil.Vogl. IV 217

2nd pers. sing. of the aor. ind. act. in -ες (ἐμέτησες) (l. 4), cf. Mandilaras 1973 § 319; Gignac II 348-349 (with further bibl. at 349 n. 1). This ending became so popular in everyday speech as to replace occasionally the class. ending even in school-books, cf. Ch. II § 1.6.

B. SB VI 9487

ἐλαιουργός (l. 8), a post-class. lexeme.

C. P.Mil.Vogl. VI 281

1. κλῑδα (l. κλεῖ-) (ll. 3-4), cf. Gignac II 53 with n. 2.
2. ἐκοῦ (l. 9), a vulgar form anticipating MGr ἐσύ, cf. Gignac II 163-164. In P.Mil.Vogl. I 24, 'Geminus' consistently used σου and σε except for one instance of σεν, see Ch. IV § 1.2.1 A.
3. The acc. of the Gr. names in -κλῆς appears in -κλῆν (Ἡρακλῆν) (l. 8), cf. Gignac II 72 (and the bibl. cit. at 70 n.1).

On the other hand, P.Mil.Vogl. I 24 is written in a very ambitious style, cf. Ch. IV § 1.2.1.

1.6. We have several autograph familiar letters of Sempronius Maximus, a late second-century individual who was much occupied with travels and business-contacts.² All of them exhibit stylistic and linguistic features characteristic of unadorned non-literary prose. Certain of these elements appear in more than one letter and, therefore, must represent recurrent constituents of Sempronius' normal epistolary usage:

(1) Grammar and Style:

1. Incongruence in gender: participles are used colloquially in the masc. instead of the

¹ P.Mil.Vogl. IV 217 (= SB VI 9486) of AD 124, SB VI 9487, P.Mil.Vogl. VI 281 (= SB VI 9484) (?), and possibly also P.Mil.Vogl. I 24 (AD 117), which has been re-edited and identified as a letter of Geminus by Foraboschi 1968, 43 ff. (but see Ch. IV § 1.2.1). On Geminus see particularly W. Bagnall 1974, 28-33 (31 ff. on the letters). For the date of his death see P.Mil.Vogl. I 25 col. iv 3-4. On the findspot of his papers see Gallazzi 1990, esp. 286-287.

² Cf. esp. Bell 1950; Sijpesteijn 1976. Sempronius' letters are: P. Wisc. II 84 (containing two or possibly three letters), P.Mich. XV 751 (one lett.), P.Mich. XV 752 (two letters), SB III 6263 (Bell no. 1 = *Sel. Pap.* I 121) (two letters), P. Heid. VII 400 (one lett.). Cf. also *New Docs.* II 21.

Appendix (B)

- fem. at SB III 6263.8, P.Mich. XV 751.9, P.Mich. XV 752.8 (all ἐρωτηθείς for -θεῖσα),¹ and P.Wisc. II 84. (col. iii) 22 (λαβών for λαβοῦσα): see § 1.3 no. 5.
2. Nom. (with article) instead of the voc. (SB III 6263.8,17; P.Mich. 751.9; P.Mich. 752.8-9): very limited in class., it develops in unpretentious Koine, see Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 147,3 (with more bibl.), Turner, *Syntax* 34-35.
 3. μετά + gen. for parataxis with καί (SB III 6263.3-4; P.Mich. 752.3-4; P.Heid. VII 400.3-4), cf. e.g. P.Alex.Giss. 40.16-17 (ii AD). On Ptol. pap. see Mayser II 2, p. 443.3-15.
 4. Pleonastic καί after μετά (SB III 6263.3; P.Mich. 752.4), cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 442,13, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. καί II 7a (citing BGU II 412.6-7, a fourth-century letter). By contrast, Sempronius did not use καί at P.Heid. VII 400.3.
 5. Parataxis with καί (SB III 6263.4-5; P.Mich. 751.3; P.Mich. 752.4-5 (?)) [ἅμα δὲ καὶ . . . ποιοῦμαι], and possibly also P.Heid. VII 400.4-5 [though without καί] where artificial prose style would use a circumstantial participle,² see in general § 1.7 C no. 1. Contrast Sempronius' own choice of the circumstantial participle at P.Wisc. II 84. (col. ii) 8, in a context where the finite vb. would be normal Greek (cf. ii 2 below).
 6. Imperative inf. (SB III 6263.9, P.Mich. 752.9): though found already in class. Greek, both in docs. (Meisterhans-Schwyzler 248) and in literary sources (Schwyzler II 380-383 with bibl. at 380 n.1; cf. Kalén 1941, 23-24), it becomes very common in non-literary Koine (much less so in the NT), presumably as a popular usage (Radermacher), see L. Radermacher, *RhM* N.F. 57 (1902) 147; Mayser II 1, pp. 150-151, 303-305; Mandilaras 1973 §§ 756 ff. (esp. 759 on SB III 6263); Moulton 179-180; Radermacher 1925, 179-180; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 389; Turner, *Syntax* 78. In both letters of Sempronius, the subj. occurs in the nom. as in class. Greek, whereas post-class. prose often employs the acc. and inf. In one other ex. of the same phrase (P.Mich. 751.10), Sempronius chose the imperative.

(2) Vocabulary:

ἡμερησίως 'daily' (unclass., cf. Lampe s.v. -ήσιος), preferred throughout (SB III 6263.5; P.Mich. 751.3; P.Mich. 752.5-6; P.Heid. VII 400.5) not only to Atticising ὁσημέραι (cf. Schmid V 175; usually foreign to unpretentious Koine prose) but also to more 'neutral' καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν (class. and post-class. of any level) and καθ' ἡμέραν (late Attic and post-class., cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ἡμέρα 2).

As we can see, none of these characteristics occurs in P.Wisc. II 84 col. ii. Yet this letter parallels the other items in displaying isolated cases of further unclass. features, whether or not strictly colloquial in nature. The following data are instructive:

A. SB III 6263.1-17

(a) Grammar:

Adversative καί co-ordinating two finite vbs. (ll. 6-7), cf. esp. Ljungvik 1932, 56. In view of its subordinate value, the first clause could have been rendered with a concessive clause with a finite vb. if a more polished style had been aimed at.

(b) Vocabulary:

μεταδίδωμι with the dat. of pers. and ὅτι + ind. 'to inform sb. that . . .', cf. LSJ s.v. 3.

¹ -θεῖς was suggested by Wilcken, *APF* 7 (1924) 111 (on SB III 6263); -θεῖς<α> is printed by most edd. (but this is not a simple scribal omission of alpha); -θείς was proposed by Bell, *REgypt* n.s 1 (1919) 204. Sijpesteijn's note (1976, 174) is inconclusive.

² This construction differs not only from class. ἅμα (+ participle or finite vb.) . . . καί/δέ (Kühner-Gerth II 231, Schwyzler II 535) but also from post-class. ἅμα δὲ καί = καί linking two independent clauses (see some of the exx. cit. in Mayser II 2, p. 527.9 ff.).

Appendix (B)

B. SB III 6263.18-30

(a) Grammar:

Transfer of 3rd declension nouns to the 1st decl. (l. 21 μητέραν), see § 1.7 A no. 2.

(b) Vocabulary:

1. μεταλαμβάνω with ὅτι + finite vb. 'to be informed that ...' (l. 20), cf. LSJ s.v. [I] 6.
2. κολαφίζω (ll. 23-24).
3. γλυκασία (l. 29), a hapax, see LSJ Rev.Suppl. s.v.

C. P.Mich. 751

1. πῶς after a *verbum affectus* (θαυμάζω) (l. 4): on this construction of θαυμάζω see particularly Ljungvik 1926, 67 (cf. also § 1.3 no. 1).
2. 2nd aor. formation of γίγνομαι with 1st aor. endings (ll. 5 παραγενάμενος, 9 ἐγενάμην), cf. Mandilaras 1973 § 318(1), Gignac II 344.
3. Anarthrous inf. of purpose with vb. of motion (ἔρχομαι) (l. 27). Foreign to class. prose,¹ it is frequently found in unpretentious Koine: on Hell. and early Rom. pap. see Mayser II 1, pp. 296-297; Mandilaras 1973 § 770; on the NT and other literature cf. Radermacher 1925, 186-187; Pernot 1927, 102 ff.; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 390, 1 (with more bibl. and information on the normal and exceptional Attic usage); Turner, *Syntax* 134-135. The construction, however, was not strictly colloquial, since it was used not only by Clement of Alexandria (Scham 1913, 107) but also by the Atticists (Schmid I 242, II 56, III 79, IV 81-82) and the novelists (Papanikolaou 1973, 115 ff.). For the later centuries see Hult 1990, 83 (bibl. on the fourth-century Fathers), 111-112 (fifth-century biography).
4. πρὸς + acc. after εἰμί (l. 29 πρὸς ἀποδημίαν ὧν) for ἐν -μιά, cf. e.g. P.Herm. 13.10 (iv AD). It is a colloquial feature which parallels εἰς = ἐν in a local sense, on which see Meisterhans-Schwyzler 215; Johannesson 1926, 330 ff.; Mayser II 2, p. 373.3-16 (with exx. of εἰς after παρεπιδημέω and ἀποδημέω); Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 205; Turner, *Syntax* 254-255; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. 9a (with further bibl. and refs. to (non-)lit. Koine sources). Cf. also the NT exx. of πρὸς + acc. of places and things answering the question 'where?' as cited by Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 239,3. For the reverse phenomenon see § 1.4 D (b) 5.

D. P.Mich. 752.27-44

1. τάχιον (l. 39), a non-puristic lexeme avoided by ambitious prose, see Ch. III § 1.2.1 (the present case is no. 13 in the list supplied at Ch. III § 1.2.1.2.3).
2. σκυλμός 'annoyance' (l. 35).

E. P.Wisc. II 84 col. ii

(a) Grammar:

1. εἰς ... ἕτερος (ll. 3-4), which parallels post-class., yet not necessarily colloquial, ὁ εἰς ... ὁ ἕτερος (Moulton 1901, 439; Völker 1903, 5; Mayser II 1, p. 57; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 247,3; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. εἰς 5d) for normal class. ὁ μὲν ... ὁ δέ (rare already in Ptol. pap., see Mayser II 1, pp. 56-57; cf. Völker 1903, 5). Note ὁ μὲν ... ὁ δέ ἕτερος in class. Attic inscriptions (Meisterhans-Schwyzler 250). For the omission of the article see e.g. P.Sarap. 46.9-11 = P.Amh. II 88 (AD 128).
2. εἴαν = ἄν with limitative ὥς + subj. (l. 11 ὥς εἴαν δύνῃ) to emphasise the undetermined conditional aspect of the clause ('so far as your (at present indefinable) possibilities may permit'). Unclass. and uncommon, it is related to the much more

¹ Attic normally used the fut. participle, cf. Kühner-Gerth I 61; Schwyzler II 295-296; Stahl 1907, 685-686. However, the inf. of purpose was regarded as an Attic feature by some of the grammarians, see *Schol. Ab(BCE³)T II. 2.183* (I 220.55 Erbse), Hedberg 1935.

Appendix (B)

frequent (and much more thoroughly-studied) use of ἔάν = ἔν in rel. clauses,¹ which seems to have been characteristic of unadorned prose, both literary and non-literary, until approximately the time of Sempronius, and to have later enjoyed greater diffusion into every type of non-classicistic performance while remaining especially common in lower level non-literary prose (Rydbeck 1967, esp. 144).

3. δυνηθησόμεθα (l. 15), unclass., found also in lit. Koine, cf. Gignac II 325 with n.1.²

(b) Post-class. Vocabulary:

1. διακατέχομαι + dat. 'to hold fast to sth.' (l. 6). The verb as such is unclass.; in addition, Sempronius used the intr. middle instead of the normal act. On this phenomenon see § 1.7 A no. 4.
2. νωθρία 'indisposition' (ll. 6-7).

F. P.Wisc. II 84 col. iii

ὕπερ with the acc. after vb. of suffering (λυπέω) (ll. 35-36) instead of the normal gen. It is an unclass. usage, cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ὕπερ lae.

Unlike all the other letters, however, P.Wisc. II 84 col. ii also exhibits stylistic and grammatical elements which suggest that Sempronius made an attempt to raise his normal style.

(i) Style:

1. Ll. 3-7 (ἐκομισάμην (l. -ομι-) . . . δύο ἐπιστολάς (l. ἐπι-), μείαν (l. μι-) μὲν περὶ ὧν ἐδήλωσα . . . , ἑτέραν δὲ περὶ τῆς κυρίας . . . ὡς κινδυνευ[ο]υσίας (sic) . . . καὶ . . . δεικακατεχομένης (l. δια-)) display an elegant period. Note (a) the use of parallelism as an appositive expansion of the main clause instead of a simple co-ordination of two clauses (indeed, Sempronius seems to have adopted this construction in P.Mich. 751.10-11); (b) the use of the correlatives μὲν . . . δέ to strengthen the antithesis: in Koine, they occur much less frequently in unpretentious sources than in higher level prose, cf. Mayser II 3, p. 128, Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 447,2. For close parallels from Roman and Byzantine papyri cf. P.Sarap. 46.9-11 = P.Amh. II 88 (AD 128) ἐν δυοὶ κοίταις . . . ὧν μιᾷς μὲν . . . ἑτέρας δὲ . . . ; P.Abinn. 60.6-8 = P.Gen. I 48 (AD 346) βόες . . . δύο, . . . ἡ μία μὲν . . . τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν; P.Oxy. XLVIII 3415.6-7 (AD 376?)

¹ Cf. S. Langdon, *AJPh* 24 (1903) 447-451; P. Barale, *Didaskaleion* 2 (1913) 439-455; Radermacher 1925, 203; Mayser II 1, pp. 261,263-264,265,267; Schwyzer II 306 with n. 3; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 107 (with more bibl.); Rydbeck 1967, 119-144, 182-183. On the occasional class. cases see esp. Rydbeck 1967, 136-138, 142-143. On its conditional character see Langdon 451, Rydbeck 1967, 141.

² As regards μὴ ληρήσεις (ll. 9-10), two interpretations are possible. (a) It may be a misspelling for -σης (cf. Gignac I 239-240), which would produce a normal prohibitive subj.: a close parallel is P.Fay. 114.21 (cit. by Mandilaras 1973 § 563(7)), a letter of Bellicenus Gemellus (on whom see § 1.1). (b) It may be a correctly-spelled form (cf. Gignac II 358-359) to be interpreted as a colloquial confusion of the prohibitive fut. ind. (normal negation οὐ) and the prohibitive aor. subj. (normal negation μὴ). The frequent occurrence not only of the orthographic interchange εἰ/ἦ but also of the prohibitive subj. in papyri (Horn 1926, 93 ff.; Mayser II 1, pp. 148-149, II 2, p. 548; Mandilaras 1973 §§ 562 ff.) speaks in favour of (a). In P.Wisc. II 84. (col. ii) 1-19, and in all the other letters alike, Sempronius always spells correctly the forms of the subj. in -ης and almost never misspells εἰ for ἦ/ἡ, but this is no sufficient argument against (a), and λυπῇ for -πεῖ (not -πῇ, pace Sijpesteijn 1976, 180) occurs at P.Wisc. II 84. (col. iii) 36 in the same papyrus sheet, though in a different letter. Against (b): I cannot cite any close parallel for such confusion (the ex. in Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 364,3 is probably to be explained on the basis of the context, see *ibid.* § 427,1).

Appendix (B)

ἵνα τὰ εἴκοσι τέσσαρα νομισμάτια συμπληρώσητε, τὰ μὲν εἴκοσι . . . τὰ δὲ τέσσαρα . . . (this letter displays further elements of refined style); Ptol. exx. are listed by Mayser II 1, p. 57. Sempronius also used μὲν . . . δέ in P.Mich. 751.27-28 in a less elaborate context.

2. Ll. 7-9 exhibit a periodic sentence structure (main vb. + acc. and inf. with circumstantial participle + temporal clause + indirect question).

(ii) Grammar:

1. ὥς with the participle (ll. 5-6 [*scil.* ἐκομισάμην ἐπιστολὴν] περὶ τῆς κυρίας ἡμῶν μητρὸς ὥς κινδυνευ[ο]υσίας [*sic*] αὐτῆς καὶ . . . δειακατεχομένης [l. δια-] '[I received a letter] about our lady mother as being in danger and unwell') in place either (a) of declarative ὥς with a finite vb. (*περὶ τῆς κυρίας ἡμῶν μητρὸς ὥς κινδυνεύει καὶ . . . διακατέχεται) (apparently Sempronius himself used this construction in P.Mich. 752.32-33 ¹ under the constraint of context), or (b) of the (articular) inf. (*περὶ (τοῦ) τῆς κυρίας ἡμῶν μητρὸς κινδυνεῦσαι καὶ διακατέχεσθαι) (but in that case, the focus is on the news, and not on the person). However, αὐτῆς points to a confusion with the gen. absol. ² and suggests that Sempronius was clumsy with high level composition.
2. Circumstantial participle with ἅμα (ll. 7-8 με ἄγων[ι]ᾶν | ἅμα μηδὲ . . . κοιμώμενον) where prose of any stylistic level would use a finite vb. (μηδὲ κοιμᾶσθαι). Perhaps it represents another clumsy attempt at artificial style; it may be noted that Sempronius himself used the finite vb. along with ἅμα in contexts where the participle would make the style more artistic (see above, (1) no. 5).

Evidently, while opting for unsophisticated performance of fairly homogeneous characteristics in the vast majority of letters, Sempronius retained only a sprinkling of lower level linguistic items in P.Wisc. II 84 col. ii, where he substituted his normal unpretentious style with clear, yet partly clumsy, attempts to raise the level of performance in terms of language and style.

1.7. In the mid-fourth century, Aurelius Papnuthis, a collector of taxes and manager of estates, wrote several letters on practical matters.³ Four of them (P.Oxy. 3396-3399) are addressed to members of his family, one (P.Oxy. 3400) to his landlord. Their style is generally informal and colloquial, as the following examples will show:

(1) P.Oxy. 3396

1. Iterative use of καί to co-ordinate four main clauses introduced by three different subjects (ll. 15-20). The functions of καί's are, respectively, that of consecutive 'and so, so' (l. 18),⁴ that of 'therefore, accordingly' (l. 19, cf. Ljungvik 1932, 59), and that

¹ γράφεις μοι περὶ Λωβώτου [ὥς] προ[φ]ασε[ί]ζω (προ[φ]ασε[ί]ζω (l. -ίζω) *supplevi*) 'you write to me about Lobotes, (saying) that I make excuses'. For the use of act. forms of deponent vbs. see § 1.7 C no. 4. The sense seems consistent with Sempronius' subsequent self-defence for doing his best to fulfil Maximus' requests (concerning Lobotes?). A participial form (-ντος, -μενου) suits neither the spacing nor the traces.

² In Koine prose, the genitive absolute often includes an explicit reference to the preceding clause, see Ch. IV § 1.2.1 C no. 2.

³ P.Oxy. XLVIII 3396-3400. Papnuthis is recorded in sources of AD 342 - (?) 376, see Shelton 1981, 74-75, where his career is outlined.

⁴ For close parallels see Ljungvik 1932, 60. Cf. also Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 442 with n. 2; Turner, *Syntax* 334.

Appendix (B)

of temporal 'then' (l. 20).¹ Artistically-developed prose would use more elaborate sentence structure. On the colloquial uses of καί see in general S. Trenkner, *Le style καί dans le récit attique oral* (Assen 1959).

2. Heavy repetition of ἀσπάζομαι (l. 21 ff.).

(2) P.Oxy. 3397

1. Asyndetic imperatives σπούδασον . . . ἀπόστιλον (l. 7). For close parallels see Ljungvik 1932, 98; in general, pp. 95-99 and Tabachovitz 1943, 6 ff. focus on sequences of asyndetic imperatives the first of which means 'be kind, be eager, come on, please', etc. Cf. also Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 461 with n. 1; Turner, *Syntax* 342.
2. Frequent parataxis with καί. At l. 11, καί is used after an imp. in the sense 'and so, so':² in such circumstances, a more polished style would require a conditional clause. Parataxis also occurs at ll. 13, 16, 21 (?) (inceptive καί = δέ).

In P.Oxy. 3400, however, Papnuthis used connective particles at the beginning of clauses more extensively than he did in the other letters. All the items without exclusion display many errors and a large number of linguistic features characteristic of lower level non-literary prose. No attempt is made to elevate the linguistic performance. The following data are instructive:

A. P.Oxy. 3396

1. οἶδαται (l. -τε) (ll. 9,10), a non-puristic form: purists recommended ἴστε (Ch. III § 1.3.5 B 8).
2. Transfer of 3rd declension nouns to the 1st decl. (ll. 27-28 πατέραν, 29 μητέραν), cf. Gignac II 45 (with further bibl. at p. 46 n. 2).
3. ἐπί + gen. with vb. of motion (l. 20), cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. 1aβ; Mayser II 2, pp. 369.17 ff., 464.37 ff.; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 234 with n. 2; Turner, *Syntax* 271; Fritz 1898, 156 ff.
4. Use of the middle instead of the act. (l. 19 παραμένωμαι [l. -μένομαι³]), a characteristic of unpretentious prose (Mayser II 1, p. 112 ff.; Radermacher 1925, 79; Kapsomenakis 1938, 16 n. 1, 130; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 316; Turner, *Syntax* 54-56) which teachers proscribed (Ch. II § 1.5). It is also found in literary sources in proportion to their classicising pretension: cf. Schmid III 69-70 (Aelian), Papanikolaou 1973, 61 ff. (the novelists); Dürr 1899-1901, 32 (Maximus of Tyre). On late antique epistolographers see Fritz 1898, 95.
5. Pres. for fut. (ll. 19-20 παραμένωμαι [l. -μένομαι] . . . ἀπέρχωμαι [l. -χομαι]). A colloquial usage.⁴

The letter also displays several grammatical errors. The orthography is often defective. L. 2 (heading !) has Μαρία for -ρία and Παπνοθίου for -θις. Incorrect syntax is found at ll. 3-4 (Shelton 1981, 93 *ad loc.*), 7-8 (Εὐδαίμων [i.e., πρὸς + nom. !] for -μονα), 13 (γίνωσκε . . . ὑμᾶς θέλω. The error originates from a conflation of two formulae), and 21

¹ Cf. the exx. cited by Ljungvik 1932, 85 and Turner, *Syntax* 334.

² Exx. of this colloquial usage are found in class. Greek (Kühner-Gerth II 248,5; Ljungvik 1932, 60 n. 1) and in Koine (Ljungvik 1932, 60-61; Tabachovitz 1943, 9-10; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. I 2f).

³ -μενῶμαι (*ed.pr.*) is incorrect.

⁴ Cf. Mayser II 1, pp. 133-134 (with bibl.); Mandilaras 1973 § 214 ff.; Radermacher 1925, 152; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 323 (with further bibl.); Turner, *Syntax* 63. This usage is already attested for class. Greek: cf. Kühner-Gerth I 137-138; Stahl 1907, 88.4; Schwyzer II 273; J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, I² (Basel 1926) 158 ff.

Appendix (B)

ff. (frequent use of the nom. in place of the acc.).

B. P.Oxy. 3397

1. οἶδας (l. 8), a non-puristic form, cf. Ch. III § 1.3.3 I i no. 1.
 2. οἶδες (l. 20), a late form, cf. Mandilaras 1973 §§ 135, 445(2); Gignac II 353-354.
 3. Perf. in place of the aor. (l. 16 δέδωκα), cf. C no. 5 below.
 4. σήμερον (ll. 7,14,23), a non-puristic form, cf. Ch. III § 1.3.2.
- The orthography is often incorrect.

C. P.Oxy. 3398

1. Anacoluthon (ll. 2-3 ἐλθὼν . . . καὶ εἶπεν) resulting from a conflation of ἐλθὼν . . . εἶπεν (circumstantial participle + finite vb.) with ἦλθεν . . . καὶ εἶπεν (co-ordination of two finite vbs.). The former is commoner in polished prose,¹ whereas the latter is particularly frequent in colloquial performance, cf. O. Lagercrantz, *Eranos* 14 (1914) 175-176; Ljungvik 1932, 79-80; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 471,4; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. καί I 1e.
2. 2nd pers. sing. of the perf. ind. act. in -ες (ll. 20-21 πεποίηκες for -ηκας), cf. Mandilaras 1973 §§ 444, 445(2); Gignac II 353-354 (with more bibl. at 353 n. 5). The form is occasionally found in texts used for school instruction (Ch. II § 1.6).
3. Augment in the subj. (l. 14 ἀπηντήσω): a low level usage, cf. Mandilaras 1973 § 272, Gignac II 234.
4. Act. forms of deponent vbs. (l. 12 ἀκροᾷσε [l. -σαι], see Shelton 1981, 98 *ad loc.*): cf. Mayser I 2, pp. 164-165; Mandilaras 1973 § 316; Gignac II 326. At least one teacher is known to have recommended that pupils avoid it (Ch. II § 1.5).
5. Confusion of aor. and perf. (ll. 10-13 ἐκέλευσεν . . . πεποίηκεν). There is an extensive bibliography on this topic, and different views have been expressed on many aspects and questions of detail.²

The orthography is often incorrect.

D. P.Oxy. 3400

1. Agreement of a neut. plur. subject with a plur. vb. (ll. 6-8 ὀνόματα . . . εὐρήθησαν), cf. Mayser II 3, p. 28 ff. (29.38 ff. on neuters of pers.); Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 133 (esp. n. 1); Turner, *Syntax* 312-313. But the plur. with neuters designating persons

¹ But it is also found in unsophisticated papyri, cf. Mandilaras 1973 § 896 (but P.Fay. 123.15-16 ἐλήλυθεν . . . λέγων is not relevant).

² General studies: P. Chantraine, *Histoire du parfait grec* (Paris 1927) 233-245; E. Mihevc, 'La disparition du parfait dans le grec de la basse époque', *Slov. Akad. Znam. in Umjetnosti v Ljublj., Cl. II (Philol. et litt.)* 5 (1956) 91-154; K.L. Mc Kay, 'The Use of the Ancient Greek Perfect down to the Second Century A.D.', *BICS* 12 (1965) 1-21; cf. Moulton 141 ff. — Papyri: F. Eakin, 'Aorists and Perfects in First Century Papyri', *AJTh* 20 (1916) 266-273; Mayser II 1, pp. 140-141; B.G. Mandilaras, 'Confusion of Aorist and Perfect in the Language of the Non-Literary Papyri', in *Akten des XIII. Intern. Papyrol.-Kongr., Marburg/Lahn, 2-6 Aug. 1971* (Münch. Beitr. z. Pap.-forsch. u. ant. Rechtsgesch. 66, Munich 1974) 251-261 = *EEATH* 21 (1970-71) 291-302 = Mandilaras 1972, 9-21, 171-172; Mandilaras 1973 §§ 470-474; K.L. Mc Kay, 'On the Perfect and Other Aspects in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri', *BICS* 27 (1980) 23-49. — *New Testament*: Moulton cit.; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 343; Turner, *Syntax* 68-69, 81; K.L. Mc Kay, 'On the Perfect and Other Aspects in New Testament Greek', *NT* 23 (1981) 289-329. — *Literary Koine Greek* (select bibl.): Fr. Hultsch, 'Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybios. Ein Beitrag zur Syntax der gemeingriechischen Sprache', in *Abh. d. Kön. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl.* 13, I (1891) 15 and II (1893) 458 ff.; de Foucault 1972, 134 ff. (Polyb.); Schmid I 95, II 52, III 75, IV 77 (Atticists and further bibl. on lit. Koine); Papanikolaou 1973, 71-74

Appendix (B)

- (like here ὀνόματα) is also class. (Kühner-Gerth I 65; Gildersleeve II 468 ff.).
2. συνέθετο μετ' αὐτοῦ for αὐτῷ (l. 32). For exx. of compounds with συν- + μετά instead of the dat. cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 202.
 3. Confusion of aor. and perf. (ll. 7-8 δέδωκεν . . . εὐρήθησαν; 32-33 συνέθετο . . . καὶ . . . ἐπιδέδωκεν), see C no. 5 above.
 4. Act. for the middle (ll. 5,18-19, 23-24, 31 ὑποδέχω): cf. C no. 4 above.
 5. ἀπό + gen. as partitive in place of the simple gen. (l. 21). Like ἐκ, it is characteristic of unpretentious Koine: cf. Mayser II 2, p. 348 ff.; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 164 (with more bibl.); Turner, *Syntax* 208-209. Cf. also A. Wilhelm, *WS* 61-62 (1943-1947) 167-189.
 6. ὅτι *recitativum* (ll. 10,13,20), cf. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 470 with n. 1 (with bibl.; add E. Kieckers, *Glotta* 11 [1921] 183).
 7. λοιπόν as a progressive particle (l. 18). A colloquial usage.¹
 8. *Constructio ad sensum* (l. 34 ὀνόματα . . . τελοῦντες [for -οῦντα]), cf. Mayser II 3, p. 38.45 ff.; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 134 with n. 2.
- The orthography is frequently defective.

Non-technical vocabulary is also unclassical:

- i. ἐξοδιάζω (P.Oxy. 3396.19).
- ii. ὅρος 'decision, order' (P.Oxy. 3400.6), see Lampe 975 *s.v.*
- iii. διαφέρω + dat. 'to belong to' (ll. 8,10), see LSJ *s.v.* III 8 and esp. Lampe 362 *s.v.* 3; Humbert 1930, 177; Tabachovitz 1946, 149-150, where the alternative construction with the gen. is also discussed.
- iv. διαστέλλω = ἀποστέλλω ? (l. 33).

Evidently Papnuthis' casual performance consisted in a markedly inelegant utterance characterised by the extensive use of vulgar linguistic variants.

1.8. In the same period, a pious layman called Paul addressed to Nephros, a prominent monk of the Hathor monastery in the Heracleopolite nome, no less than nine letters containing requests for spiritual intercession and offers of favours.² Their style is essentially unpretentious, but Paul seems to have been more skilful than Papnuthis with prose composition. He was able to produce fluid periods (cf. e.g. P.Neph. 1. 3-9), and made consistent use of connective particles at the beginning of clauses. Furthermore, while still displaying linguistic features characteristic of lower level non-literary Koine,

(novelists); Fritz 1898, 98-99 ('literary' letter-writing); Usener 1907, 52 (one ex. of high style hagiography); Hägg 1975, 79; van Dielen 1979, 64, 70; Hunger 1981, 169-170 (Byz. summaries and metaphrases).

¹ Cf. esp. A. Cavallin, '(τὸ) λοιπόν. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung', *Eranos* 39 (1941) 136 ff.; Blomqvist 1969, 102-103; Mayser II 3, pp. 145-146; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 451 n. 6. See also Tabachovitz 1943, 30 and Karlsson 1962, 82.

² P.Neph. 1-9. More papyri belonging to the same archive were acquired in 1990 and are being prepared for publication (B. Kramer 1993, 223-224); but whether this unpublished material includes more letters of Paul I do not know. Date: P.Neph. 8 must be assigned to the 350s on the grounds of the prices mentioned in the text, cf. R. Bagnall, *ZPE* 76 (1989) 74-75; the whole archive seems later than AD 344, cf. Kramer-Shelton 1987, 3-5. For further information on Paul, Nephros, and Hathor see Kramer-Shelton 1987, 3-34; B. Kramer 1993, 223 ff.

his letters are characterised by a higher degree of grammatical correctness and even by the occasional reception of elements of refined language. Certain of his chosen variants also represent standard elements in the contemporary linguistic system rather than vulgar features. The following data, all of which have been extracted from P.Neph. 1, will suffice to illustrate the major constituents of Paul's normal linguistic performance:

A. Lower Level Items:

1. ὑπομνήσκω with ὅπως + subj. (l. 6 ff.) denoting an injunction or suggestion (unclass.) instead of the inf. Similar analytical constructions include:
 - (a) iussive ὑπομνήσκω with ἵνα, a colloquial construction found in papyri (P.Lond. VI 1924.6-7 [mid iv AD, lett.] ¹) and elsewhere (note esp. the exx. in the letters of Basil of Caesarea in concurrence with the inf. ²);
 - (b) μμνήσκω with ὅπως (Mandilaras 1973 § 594, unfortunately uninformative) or ἵνα (§ 1.4 D (a)).
 Was ὅπως preferred to ἵνα in P.Neph. 1 out of a desire for stylistic refinement? ³ The inf. is more frequent in refined prose, but occasional occurrences are also found in early Christian literature (cf. NT Tit. 3.1, cit. by Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ὑπομ. 1a) and in unpretentious papyri, see P.Oxy. XVII 2152.4-5 (iii AD), P.Mich. XI 624.14-15 (early vi AD), and possibly also P.Alex.Giss. 54.7 (AD 117-38).⁴ On the usage of Basil of Caesarea see above. In Byz. Greek, it seems to represent a learned reminiscence, cf. Aalto 1953, 101. For further information on the alternative constr. inf. / ἵνα + subj. and the interpretative problems which face the linguist see Ch. I § 3.4.4.1.2 no. 5 II.
2. Article as a rel. pronoun (l. 21), attested already in fourth-century BC private Attic inscriptions (Meisterhans-Schwyzler 156; S. Witkowski, *Glotta* 6 [1915] 24-25, who favoured an influence of Ionic) and then used in vulgar Koine, cf. Jannaris 1897 § 1438; esp. Völker 1903, 6; Moulton 1904, 155; Radermacher 1925, 75; Ljungvik 1932, 52; Kapsomenakis 1938, 117; it is foreign even to the NT, see Radermacher 1925, cit., Turner, *Syntax* 37.

B. Features of Standard Late Greek:

1. πιστεύω with ὅτι-clause (ll. 13-14 πιστεύομεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν . . . ἀκούσεται) in place of the (acc. and) inf. (good class., cf. LSJ s.v. π. [I] 3, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. π. 1aγ). Three arguments suggest that Paul's choice reflects, not vulgar speech, but standard contemporary usage. (a) In Rom. Koine, the ὅτι-clause (late Attic, cf. LSJ s.v. π. [I] 3) was apparently avoided only by very strict Atticists, who seem to have consistently favoured the (acc. and) inf. after πιστεύω and the like (Schmid II 58). Though common in non-lit. prose (Mandilaras 1973 § 802, unfortunately

¹ Other cases are uncertain. In P.Ant. III 192.8-9 (iv AD, lett.), for instance, is ἵνα (or ὅπως) to be restored at the end of l. 8 after ὑπεμνήσκ[ε(ν)] as an introductory particle for ποιήσης (l. 9)?

² The two constructions seem to have been interchangeable: contrast (ed. Courtonne) *ep.* 89.1.10-11 (AD 372) ὑπομνήσκομεν καταξιώσαι σε πάντα τυπῶσαι with *ep.* 83.10-12 (AD 372) ἡγοῦμαι πρέπει μοι ὑπομνήσαι σου τὴν χρηστότητα ἵνα . . . καταξιώσης παρασχέσθαι and *ep.* 218. 13-14 (AD 375) ὑπομνήσκω ἵνα καταξιώσης . . . πέμψαι (ἵνα is not final *pace* Courtonne, who translates 'afin que'). (In *ep.* 265.3.1-3 the fact that *περὶ τῶν κατὰ Μάρκελλον* in the main clause is resumed by *περὶ αὐτῶν* in the ἵνα-clause indicates that this clause is independent of ὑπομνησθῆναι and must be taken as final ['pour que' Courtonne]). Other exx. of the inf.: *epp.* 78.5, 126.8-9, 296.7-9.

³ Cf. Ch. I § 3.4.4.2 no. 5.

⁴ ὑπομνήσκω πέμψαι, or full stop after ὑπομ. as in *ed.pr.*?

uninformative) and in the *NT* (Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 397,2; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. π. 1aβ) except for occasional exx. of the (acc. and) inf.,¹ ὅτι was also used in different proportions in lit. sources of varying degrees of puristic pretension (Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. π. 1aβ [on Aelian see also Schmid III 80]; Papanikolaou 1973, 137-138). (b) ὅτι was normally used by Christian writers, and occurs in fourth-century 'literary' epistolography in concurrence with the more frequent (acc. and) inf.: the choice between the two constructions was sometimes influenced by external factors.² (c) Christian literary works occur in which ὅτι was specifically used to say 'I/we believe that God/the Lord will . . . ' as in P.Neph. 1: cf. Basil.Caes. ep. 190.2.4-5 Court. (AD 374) πιστεύω γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ Θεῷ ὅτι δώσει.

2. 3rd pers. plur. of the refl. pronoun instead of the 1st (ἐαυτῶν for ἡμῶν αὐτῶν) (l. 15). Found occasionally in Attic, it represents the normal post-class. usage: it was used even by second-century Atticists and by Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea, and Synesius in their letters.³ Yet it was parodied as a solecism by Luc. *Soloec.* 4 (οὐδὲν γνωσόμεθα τῶν ἐαυτῶν), and its grammatical correctness was disputed in

¹ Cf. Mayser II 1, p. 312; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. π. 1aγ; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 397,2; Turner, *Syntax* 137. Mandilaras 1973 § 802 is uninformative.

² Gregory of Nazianzus (ed. Gaillet, GCS): ὅτι: ep. 65.4 p. 59.19-20 (= [Basil.Caes.] ep. 166.18-19 Court.) (AD 374), where the ὅτι-clause establishes a close correspondence with Psalm 65.12 and produces a regular accentual clausula 6-PrO); inf.: epp. 58.2,3 p. 52.10-11, 14 (AD 372) (in the latter case, the constr. with the inf. was used to establish a stylistic parallelism with the following δέ-clause and to produce the characteristic accentual clausula 2-PPr), 191.2 p. 139.3. — Basil of Caesarea (ed. Courtonne): ὅτι (excluding 234.3.13-14 which is a quotation from the *NT*): epp. 8.12.6-7, 42.2.68-69, 190.2.4-5 (cit. at (c) below); inf.: e.g. epp. 8.2.39, 8.2.4-5, 22.1.37-38, 38.4.9-11, 80.3-4, 116.26); ὅτι used side by side with the inf.: ep. 235.1.6 ff. (πιστεῦσαι δεῖ πρῶτον ὅτι ἄλφα λέγεται καί, μαθόντα τοὺς χαρακτῆρας . . . , ὕστερον λαβεῖν καὶ τὴν ἀκριβῆ κατανόησιν).

³ Cf. in general Jannaris 1897 § 546; Kühner-Gerth I 572; Schwyzer I 197; Koch 1909, 13. See most recently R.D. Woodard, *On Interpreting Morphological Change. The Greek Reflexive Pronoun* (Amsterdam 1990) (p. 6 on previous interpretations), who is aware of the existence of stylistic differences between the sources (cf. his Preface), but fails to investigate style as a factor of change/conservation. ἐαυτ- for the 1st and 2nd pers. plur. is attested not only in Ptol., Rom., Byz. papyri (Moulton 1901, 441; Moulton 1904, 154; Mayser I 2, pp. 63-64; Gignac II 167 with bibl. on Attic and Hell. (non-)lit. Gr.) and the biblical literature (*LXX*: Woodard 20-27; *NT*: Moulton 87;

antiquity.¹

C. Elements Characteristic of Refined Linguistic Performance:

ἀκούσεται (l. 14) with fut. middle form. Found in class. Greek, it was often used in post-class. prose of various stylistic registers: besides the bibl. cit. below, see particularly the exx. attested in literary epistolography: Basil.Caes. *ep.* 20.20 Court. (AD 364 or 365); Syn. *epp.* 154 p. 272.15 (AD 405) and 69 p. 125.3 Garzya (AD 411); v.l. in Greg.Naz. *ep.* 11.2 p. 13.17 Gallay, GCS (AD 362-372) [ἀκούσῃ h : ἀκούεις u¹dfg, rightly]. By the fourth century AD, the act. had become characteristic of Koine, both literary and non-literary (Veitch 1887 s.v.; LSJ s.v.; Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 77 [with information on attestations as v.l.]; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v.; Mandilaras 1973 § 367(1); Gignac II 321 with n. 3), but was avoided in literary letter-writing.

P.Neph. 1, just as some of the other letters, is also characterised by a moderate impact of purism: for the relevant data and a discussion of the problems cf. Ch. III § 1.3.3 IV A-E.

Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf § 64,1; Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ἑαυτοῦ 2; Woodard 41-43), but also in lit. Koine of various stylistic registers. In Hell. Koine, exx. occur in the Letter of Aristeas (Meecham 1935, 105; Woodard 27-31) and Polybius (de Foucault 1972, 84-85 [wrongly taking it as an 'usage de la langue de chancellerie']; Woodard 31-40). In Rom. Koine, exx. occur even in declamations (Dürr 1899-1901, 29) and the Atticists (Schmid I 82-83, 228, IV 69-70). For late antique epistolography see Greg.Naz. *ep.* 221.5 p. 159.24 Gallay, GCS ἑαυτῶν = ἡμῶν αὐτῶν (lett. to a monk), cit. by Gallay 1933, 45; cf. Fritz 1898, 40 and 92-93; Trunk 1911, 31-32). For Byz. Greek see e.g. Vogeser 1907, 20-22; Linnér 1943, 84; Psaltes 1913, 196; further bibl. in Böhlig 1956, 60. For discussions in nineteenth-century scholarship see the refs. gathered by R. Schneider, *Grammatici Graeci*, I 2. *Commentarium crit. et exeg. in Apollonii scripta minora* (1902) 104-105.

¹ Apoll.Dysc. raised objections against it in *De pron.*, ed. Schneider, *Gramm. Gr.* II 1, p. 78.14-15, but defended it with different arguments in *De synt.* 3.3-5, ed. Uhlig, *Gramm. Gr.* II 2, pp. 269.8-271.4; *ibid.* 3.23, ed. Uhlig, *Gramm. Gr.* II 2, p. 290.4-8; *Περὶ τοῦ ῥήμ.*, ed. Schneider, *Gramm. Gr.* II 3, p. 121.15 ff. (ap. Choerob. *Comm. in Theod. Can.*, ed. Hilgard, *Gramm. Gr.* IV 2, p. 125.27 ff.). For more refs. to ancient grammarians see Böhlig 1956, 59.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

The present bibliography lists all modern works that are cited more than once in the footnotes; included are also some important works of general interest that are cited only once. All other works are given in full in the footnotes. For abbreviations other than those listed below, see above, pp. 8-14.

Aalto, Pentti

- 1953 — *Studien zur Geschichte des Infinitivs im Griechischen* (Ann. Acad. Sc. Fenn. B 80.2, Helsinki)

Alpers, Klaus

- 1981 — *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros. Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe der Fragmente* (SGLG 4, Berlin - New York)

Amelotti, Mario - Migliardi Zingale, Livia

- 1985 — *Le costituzioni giustinianee nei papiri e nelle epigrafi*, seconda ed. (Flor. St. Univ. - Leg. Iust. Imp. Vocab., Subsidia 1, Milan)

Anderson, Graham

- 1993 — *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire* (London - New York)

Anlauf, G.

- 1961 — *Standard Late Greek oder Atticismus? Eine Studie zum Optativgebrauch im nachklassischen Griechisch* (Diss. Cologne)

Argyle, Sonia

- 1989 — 'A New Greek Grammarian', *CQ* n.s., 39 (83) (1989) 524-535

Bagnall, Roger S.

- 1993 — *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton)

Bagnall, Whitney Scofield

- 1974 — *The Archive of Laches: Prosperous Farmers of the Fayum in the Second Century* (PhD Diss. Duke University)

Baldwin, Barry

- 1981 — 'Physical Descriptions of Byzantine Emperors', *Byzantion* 51 (1981) 8-21

Barabino, Giuseppina

- 1967 — *P. Rutilii Lupi Schemata dianoeas et lexeos* (Genoa)

Bastianini, Guido

- 1975 — 'Lista dei prefetti d' Egitto dal 30^a al 299P', *ZPE* 17 (1975) 263-328
1988 — 'Il prefetto d' Egitto (30 a.C. - 297 d.C.): Addenda (1973-1985)', in *ANRW II* 10.1 (1988) 503-517

Bibliography

Bell, H. Idris

- 1950 — 'A Happy Family', in S. Morenz (ed.), *Aus Antike und Orient. Festschrift W. Schubart zum 75. Geburtstag* (Leipzig) 38-47

Bichler, R.

- 1991 — 'Über die Geschichte des Hellenismus-Begriffs in der deutschen Historiographie. Leitende Gedanken, Probleme, Perspektiven', in *Ἑλληνισμός. Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 25-27 oct. 1989* éd. par S. Said (Univ. des Sciences Hum. de Strasb. - Trav. du Centre de Rech. sur le Proche-Or. et la Grèce Ant. 11, Leiden 1991) 363-386

Birley, Anthony R.

- 1992 — *Locus virtutibus patefactus ? Zum Beförderungssystem in der Hohen Kaiserzeit* (Rhein.-West. Ak. d. Wiss. - Geisteswiss. Vorträge G 318, Opladen)

Blomqvist, Jerker

- 1969 — *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose* (Lund)

Böhlig, Gertrud

- 1956 — *Untersuchungen zum rhetorischen Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften des Michael Psellos* (Deutsche Ak. d. Wiss. zu Berlin - Berl. Byz. Arb. 2, Berlin)

Bonner, Stanley F.

- 1977 — *Education in Ancient Rome from the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (London)

Bowersock, Glen W.

- 1969 — *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford)

Bowie, Ewen L.

- 1970 — 'Greeks and Their Past in the Second Sophistic', *P&P* 46 (1970) 3-41 (repr. with some changes in M.I. Finley [ed.], *Studies in Ancient Society* [London 1974] 166-209)
- 1982 — 'The Importance of Sophists', *YCIS* 27 (1982) 29-59

Bowman, Alan K.

- 1991 — 'Literacy in the Roman Empire: Mass and Mode', in M. Beard *et al.* (edd.), *Literacy in the Roman World* (JRA Suppl. 3, Ann Arbor)

Brinkmann, A.

- 1909 — 'Der älteste Briefsteller', *RhM* 64 (1909) 310-317

Brixhe, Claude

- 1990 — 'Dialectologie et idéologie', in *Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature, IX. Aussois, 31 août - 5 sept. 1987* (Paris) 41-53

Bibliography

Brixhe, Claude - Hodot, René

- 1993 — 'A chacun sa koiné ?', in Cl. Brixhe (s. la dir. de), *La Koiné grecque antique*, I. *Une langue introuvable ?* (Trav. et Mém. - Études Anciennes 10, Nancy) 7-21

Brock, Sebastian P.

- 1966 — *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel* (D.Phil. Diss., Oxford)

Browning, Robert

- 1978 — 'The Language of Byzantine Literature', in S. Vryonis Jr. (ed.), *The Past in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture* (Βυζ. καὶ Μεταβυζ. 1, Malibu [Calif.]) 103-133 (= *History, Language and Literacy in the Byzantine World* [Variorum Reprints, Northampton 1989] no. XV)
- 1983 — *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge)

Bubeník, Vít

- 1989 — *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area* (Amst. St. in the Theory and Hist. of Ling. Sc. - Curr. Iss. in Ling. Theory 57, Amsterdam)

Bureth, Paul

- 1988 — 'Le préfet d' Egypte (30 av. J.C. - 297 ap. J.C.): Etat présent de la documentation en 1973', in *ANRW II* 10.1 (1988) 472-502

Calboli, Gualtiero

- 1964-65 — 'La sinonimia latina fino alla prosa classica', *QIG* 8 (1964-65) 21-66
- 1969 — *Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium* (Ediz. e Saggi Univ. di Filol. Class. 11, Bologna)
- 1986 — 'Nota di aggiornamento', in E. Norden, *La prosa d'arte antica dal VI secolo a.C. all' età della Rinascenza*, ediz. ital. [of Norden 1958] a c. di B. Heinemann Campana, II (Rome) 969-1185
- 1989 — 'La synonymie dans la pratique et dans la théorie grammaticale et rhétorique', *Ktema* 14 (1989) 169-180

Calboli Montefusco, Lucia

- 1979 — *Consulti Fortunatiani Ars rhetorica* (Ediz. e Saggi Univ. di Filol. Class. 24, Bologna)
- 1988 — *Exordium, narratio, epilogus. Studi sulla teoria retorica greca e romana delle parti del discorso* (Univ. degli Studi di Bologna - Pubbl. del Dip. di Fil. Class. e Medioev. 1, Bologna)

Caldara, Alessandra

- 1924 — *I connotati personali nei documenti d' Egitto dell' età greca e romana* (Studi della Scuola Papirologica [di Milano] 4.2, Milan)

Calderini, Rita

- 1950 — 'Gli ἀγρόματοι nell' Egitto greco-romano', *Aegyptus* 30 (1950) 14-41

Bibliography

Caltabiano, Matilde

1991 — *L'epistolario di Giuliano imperatore* (*Koivwvia* 14, Naples)

Canfora, Luciano

1995 — *Ellenismo* (Bibl. Univ. Lat. 442, Rome-Bari [published originally in 1987 as Bibl. Cult. Mod.])

Cavallo, Guglielmo

1967 — *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (Studi e testi di papirologia 2, Florence)

1977 — 'Funzione e strutture della maiuscola greca tra i secoli VIII-XI', in *La paléographie grecque et byzantine* (Colloques Internationaux du C.N.R.S. 559, Paris) 95-137

Cavazza, Franco

1981 — *Studio su Varrone etimologo e grammatico. La lingua latina come modello di struttura linguistica* (Univ. di Bologna - Pubbl. della Fac. di Mag. n.s. 7, Florence)

Celentano, Maria Silvana

1994 — 'La codificazione retorica della comunicazione epistolare nell' *Ars rhetorica* di Giulio Vittore', *RFIC* 122 (1994) 422-435

Chantraine, Pierre

1961 — *Morphologique historique du grec*, 2nd ed. (Paris)

Chapa, Juan

1998 — *Letters of Condolence in Greek Papyri* (Papyrologica Florentina 29, Florence)

Chiron, Pierre

1993 — *Démétrios. Du style*, texte ét. et trad. par P.C. (CUF, Paris)

Clarysse, Willy

1983 — 'Literary Papyri in Documentary «Archives»', in E. van 'T Dack - P. van Dessel - W. van Gucht (edd.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven 24-26 May 1982* (Studia Hellenistica 27, Louvain), 43-61

Cockle, Walter E. H.

1987 — *Euripides, Hypsipyle. Text and Annotation Based on a Re-examination of the Papyri* (Testi e Commenti 7, Rome)

Coles, Revel A.

1966 — *Reports of Proceedings in Papyri* (Pap. Bruxellensia 4, Brussels)

Consani, Carlo

1991 — *ΔΙΑΔΕΚΤΟΣ. Contributo alla storia del concetto di «dialetto»* (Testi Linguistici 18, Pisa)

Bibliography

Costas, Procope Sarantos

- 1933 — *An Outline of the History of the Greek Language with Particular Emphasis on the Koine and the Subsequent Stages* (Bibl. Eurasiatica Americana - Ser. hist.-philol. 6, Chicago)

Cribiore, Raffaella

- 1996 — *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Am. Stud. in Pap. 36, Atlanta)
- 1997 — 'Literary School Exercises', *ZPE* 116 (1997) 53-60

Criscuolo, Lucia - Geraci, Giovanni

- 1989 — *Egitto e storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba: bilancio di un confronto. Atti del Colloquio internazionale, Bologna, 31 ag. - 2 sett. 1987, a cura di L.C. e G.C.* (Bologna)

Crönert, Wilhelm

- 1903 — *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (Leipzig, repr. Hildesheim 1963)

Debrunner, Albert — Scherer, Anton

- 1969 — *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache, II: Grundfragen und Grundzüge des nachklassischen Griechisch* (Berlin)

de Foucault, Jules-Albert

- 1972 — *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe* (Coll. d' Ét. Anc., Paris)

Deissmann, Adolf

- 1923 — *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*, 4., völlig Neubearb. Aufl. (Tübingen)

van Dieten, Jan-Louis

- 1979 — 'Bemerkungen zur Sprache der sog. vulgärgriechischen Niketasparaphrase', *ByzF* 6 (1979) 37-77

Dihle, Albrecht

- 1957 — 'Analogie und Attizismus', *Hermes* 85 (1957) 170-205
- 1977 — 'Der Beginn des Attizismus', *A&A* 23 (1977) 162-177
- 1992 — 'Attizismus', in G. Ueding (hrsg.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, I (Tübingen) 1163-1176

Dionisotti, Anna Carlotta

- 1982 — 'From Ausonius' Schooldays ? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives', *JRS* 72 (1982) 83-125
- 1988 — 'Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe', in M.W. Herren (ed.), *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: the Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages* (King's College London Medieval Studies 2, London) 1-56

Bibliography

Döllstädt, Walter

- 1934 — *Griechische Papyrusprivatbriefe in gebildeter Sprache aus den ersten vier Jahrhunderten nach Christus* (Diss. Jena)

Dover, Kenneth

- 1997 — *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (Oxford)

Dürr, Karl

- 1899-1901 — *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Dialexeis des Maximus von Tyrus* (*Philologus* Suppl.-band 8, Leipzig) 1-156

Egea, José M.

- 1987 — 'El griego de los textos medievales', *Veleia* 4 (1987) 255-284

Elliott, J.K.

- 1972 — 'Phrynichus' Influence on the Textual Tradition of the New Testament', *ZNTW* 63 (1972) 133-38
- 1976 — 'Moeris and the Textual Tradition of the Greek New Testament', in J.K. Elliott (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text. Essays in Honour of G.D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his sixty-fifth Birthday* (*NT Suppl.* 44, Leiden)

Erbse, Hartmut

- 1980 — 'Zur normativen Grammatik der Alexandriner', *Glotta* 58 (1980) 236-258

Fabrizius, Cajus

- 1962 — *Zu den Jugendschriften des Johannes Chrysostomos. Untersuchungen zum Klassizismus des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Lund)
- 1967 — 'Der sprachliche Klassizismus der griechischen Kirchenväter: ein philologisches und geistgeschichtliches Problem', *JbAC* 10 (1967) 187-99

Fischer, Eitel

- 1974 — *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (SGLG 1, Berlin-New York)

Foraboschi, Daniele

- 1968 — 'Commento a P.Mil.Vogl. 24 (117 d.C.)', *SCO* 17 (1968) 43-55

Fournet, Jean-Luc

- 1993 — 'À propos de SB XIV 11856 ou quand la poésie rencontre le document', *BIFAO* 93 (1993) 223-235
- 1997 — 'Du nouveau dans la bibliothèque de Dioscore d'Aphrodité', in B. Kramer - W. Luppe - H. Maehler - G. Poethke (edd.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.-19. 8. 1995, II* (*APF Beiheft* 3, Stuttgart-Leipzig) 297-304

Fowler, R.L.

- 1982 — 'Aristotle on the Period (*Rhet.* 3.9)', *CQ* n.s. 32 (76) (1982) 89-99

Bibliography

Fraenkel, Eduard

1932 — 'Kolon und Satz. Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes, I', *NGG* 1932, 197-213 (= Fraenkel 1964, 73-92)

1933 — 'Kolon und Satz. Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes, II', *NGG* 1933, 319-354 (= Fraenkel 1964, 93-130)

1964 — *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, I (Rome)

1965 — *Noch einmal Kolon und Satz* (*SBAW* 1965/2, Munich)

Frisk, Hjalmar

1932 — *Studien zur griechischen Wortstellung* (Göteb. Högsk. Årsskr. 39 - 1933:1, Gothenburg)

Fritz, Wilhelm

1898 — *Die Briefe des Bischofs Synesius von Kyrene. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Attizismus im IV. und V. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig)

Frösén, Jaakko

1974 — *Prolegomena to a Study of the Greek Language in the First Centuries A.D. The Problem of Koine and Atticism* (Diss. Helsinki)

Gagos, Traianos - van Minnen, Peter

1994 — *Settling a Dispute. Toward a Legal Anthropology of Late Antique Egypt* (New Texts from Ancient Cultures 1, Ann Arbor)

Gallay, Paul

1933 — *Langue et style de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze dans sa correspondance* (Coll. de Philol. Class. 1, Paris)

Gallazzi, Claudio

1990 — 'La "Cantina dei Papiri" di Tebtynis e ciò che essa conteneva', *ZPE* 80 (1990) 283-288

Gelzer, Thomas

1979 — 'Klassizismus, Attizismus und Asianismus', in *Le Classicisme à Rome aux I^{ers} siècles avant et après J.C.*, Entr. prés. et prép. par H. Flashar (Entr. sur l' Ant. Class. 25, Geneva) 1-55

Ghedini, G.

1923 — *Lettere cristiane dai papiri greci del III e del IV secolo* (Milan)

Gignac, Francis Thomas

1970 — 'The Language of Non-Literary Greek Papyri', in *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor, 13-17 August 1968* (Am. Stud. Pap. 7, Toronto) 139-152

1985 — 'The Papyri and the Greek Language', *YCIS* 28 (1985) 155-166

Bibliography

Gil, Luis

- 1987 — 'Ojeada a la koine: ensayo de caracterización periodológica', *Minerva* 1 (1987) 81-91

Goodwin, William W.

- 1897 — *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (London)

Grube, G.M.A.

- 1961 — *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style* (Phoenix Suppl. 4, Toronto)
1964 — 'The Date of Demetrius *On Style*', *Phoenix* 18 (1964) 294-302

Hägg, Tomas

- 1975 — *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur. Untersuchungen zur Technik des Referierens und Exzerpieren in der Bibliothek* (Acta Univ. Upsal. - Stud. Gr. Upsal. 8, Uppsala)

Haensch, Rudolf

- 1994 — 'Die Bearbeitungsweisen von Petitionen in der Provinz Aegyptus', *ZPE* 100 (1994) 487-546

Hagedorn, Dieter

- 1964 — *Zur Ideenlehre des Hermogenes* (Hypomnemata 8, Göttingen)

Hanson, Ann Ellis

- 1971 — 'Memorandum and Speech of an Advocate', *ZPE* 8 (1971) 15-27
1991 — 'Ancient Illiteracy', in M. Beard *et al.* (edd), *Literacy in the Roman World* (JRA Suppl. 3, Ann Arbor)

Harrauer, Hermann - Sijpesteijn, Pieter J.

- 1985 — *Neue Texte aus dem antiken Unterricht*, hrsg. von H. Harrauer - P.J. Sijpesteijn (MPER N.S. 15, Vienna)

Harris, William V.

- 1989 — *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass. - London)

Harrop, J.H.

- 1962 — 'A Christian Letter of Commendation', *JEA* 48 (1962) 132-140

Hasebroek, Johannes

- 1921 — *Das Signalement in den Papyrusurkunden* (Papyrusinstitut Heidelberg - Schr. 3, Berlin - Leipzig 1921)

Hauser, Karl

- 1916 — *Grammatik der griechischen Inschriften Lykiens* (Diss. Zurich, Basel)

Hedberg, Torsten

- 1935 — *Eustathios als Attizist* (Diss. Uppsala)

Bibliography

Helbing, Robert

1907 — *Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre* (Göttingen; repr. as second ed., 1979)

1928 — *Die Kasusyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta* (Göttingen)

Hengstl, Joachim

1978 — *Griechische Papyri aus Ägypten als Zeugnisse des öffentlichen und privaten Lebens*, ed. J. Hengstl unter Mitarbeit von G. Häge u. H. Kühnert (Munich)

Hernandez Lara, Carlos

1994 — *Estudios sobre el aticismo de Cariton de Afrodisias* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 29, Amsterdam)

Hock, Ronald F. - O'Neil, Edward N.

1986 — *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric, I. The Progymnasmata* (Society of Biblical Literature - Texts and Translations 27, Graeco-Roman Religion Series 9, Chico)

Hodot, René

1990 — *Le dialecte éolien d' Asie. La langue des inscriptions VII^e s. a.C. - IV^e s. p.C.* (Paris)

Hörandner, Wolfram

1981 — *Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur der Byzantiner* (Wien. Byz. St. 16, Vienna)

Honoré, Tony

1994 — *Emperors and Lawyers*, 2nd ed. completely rev. with a Palingenesia of third-century imperial rescripts 193-305 AD (Oxford)

Horn, Robert Chisolm

1926 — *The Use of the Subjunctive and Optative Moods in the Non-Literary Papyri* (Philadelphia)

Horsley, Greg H. R.

1989 — *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, V (Macquarie University)

1994 — 'Papyrology and the Greek Language. A Fragmentary Abecedarius of Desiderata for Future Study', in *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen, 23-29 August, 1992*, collected by A. Bülow-Jacobsen (Copenhagen) 48-70

Hovdhaugen, Even

1991 — 'The Teaching of Grammar in Antiquity', in P.Schmitter (ed.), *Sprachtheorien der abendländischen Antike* (Geschichte der Sprachtheorie 2, Tübingen) 377-391

Bibliography

Hult, Karin

- 1990 — *Syntactic Variation in Greek of the 5th Century A.D.* (Acta Univ. Gothob.-Stud. Gr. et Lat. Gothob. 52, Gothenburg)

Humbert, Jean

- 1930 — *La disparition du datif en grec (du I^{er} au X^e siècle)* (Coll. linguistique 23, Paris)

Hunger, Herbert

- 1978a — 'Stilstufen in der Geschichtsschreibung des 12. Jahrhunderts: Anna Komnene und Michael Glykas', *Byz. Stud. - Ét. Byz.* 5 (1978 = *To Honor Ivan Dujčev. Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*) 139-170
- 1978b — *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I (Handb. d. Alt.-wiss. XII 5.1, Munich)
- 1981 — *Anonyme Metaphrase zu Anna Komnene, Alexias XI-XIII. Ein Beitrag zur Erschliessung der byzantinischen Umgangssprache* (Wien. Byz. Stud. 15, Vienna)

Inglese, Lionello

- 1996 — *Plutarco. La curiosità*, introd., testo cr., trad. e comm. a c. di L. I. (Corpus Plutarchi Moraliū 24, Naples)

Jannaris, A.N.

- 1897 — *An Historical Greek Grammar, Chiefly of the Attic Dialect as Written and Spoken from Classical Antiquity down to the Present Time* (London - New York)

Jax, Karl

- 1936 — 'Zur literarischen und amtlichen Personenbeschreibung', *Klio* 29 (1936) 151-163

Jeffreys, Elisabeth & Michael

- 1990 — 'Portraits', in E. Jeffreys et al. (edd.), *Studies in John Malalas* (Byzantina Australiensia 6, Sydney) 231-244

Johannessohn, M.

- 1926 — *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta* (Mitteil. d. Septuaginta-Unternehmens III 3 = *NGG* 1926 Beiheft, Berlin)

Kaimio, Jorma

- 1979 — *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Soc. Scient. Fenn. - Comment. Human. Litt. 64, Helsinki-Helsingfors)

Kalén, Ture

- 1941 — *Selbständige Finalsätze und imperativische Infinitive im Griechischen*, I (Skrifter utg. av K. Human. Vet.-Samf. i Uppsala 34.2, Uppsala-Leipzig)

Bibliography

Kapsomenakis [= Kapsomenos], Stylianos G.

- 1938 — *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit. Beiträge zur Herstellung und Deutung einzelner Texte* (Münch. Beitr. z. Pap.-forsch. u. ant. Rechtsgesch. 28, Munich)

Kapsomenos, Stylianos G.

- 1953 — 'Das Griechische in Ägypten', *MH* 10 (1953 = *L'Originalité de l'Égypte dans le monde gréco-romain. VII^e Congrès International de Papyrologie, Genève, 1-6 sept. 1952*) 248-263
- 1958 — 'Die griechische Sprache zwischen Koine und Neugriechisch', in *Berichte zum XI. Internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongreß*, München 1958 (Munich) no. II 1 (pp. 1-39)

Karlsson, Gustav

- 1959 — *Idéologie et cérémonial dans l'épistolographie byzantine. Textes du X^e siècle analysés et commentés* (Uppsala)

Kaster, Robert A.

- 1988 — *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 11, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London)

Kenyon, Frederic G.

- 1909 — 'Two Greek School-Tablets', *JHS* 29 (1909) 29-40

Keyes, Clinton W.

- 1935 — 'The Greek Letter of Introduction', *AJPh* 56 (1935) 28-44

Kieckers, E.

- 1915 — 'Zur oratio recta in den indogermanischen Sprachen, I', *IF* 35 (1915) 1-93

Kilpatrick G.D.

- 1963 — 'Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament', in J. Blinzler - O. Kuss - F. Mussner (hrsg.), *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Regensburg 1963) 125-37

Kindstrand, Jan Fredrik

- 1982 — *The Stylistic Evaluation of Aeschines in Antiquity* (Acta Univ. Upsal. - Stud. Gr. Upsal. 18, Uppsala)

Kleijwegt, Marc

- 1991 — *Ancient Youth. The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society* (Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 8, Amsterdam)

Klock, Christoph

- 1987 — *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Rhythmus bei Gregor von Nyssa. Ein Beitrag zum Rhetorikverständnis der griechischen Väter* (Beiträge z. klass. Philol. 173, Frankfurt)

Bibliography

Koch, Reinhard

- 1909 — *Observationes grammaticae in decreta testimonia epistulas leges quae extant in Demosthenis orationibus "pro corona" et "in Midiam"* (Diss. Münster)

Koskenniemi, Heikki

- 1956 — *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Ann. Acad. Sc. Fenn. B 102.2, Helsinki)

Kramer, Bärbel

- 1993 — 'Neuere Papyri zum frühen Mönchtum in Ägypten', in G.W. Most - H. Petersmann - A.M. Ritter (edd.), *Philanthropia kai Eusebeia*. Festschrift für Albrecht Dihle zum 70. Geburtstag (Göttingen) 217-233

Kramer, Bärbel - Shelton, John C.

- 1987 — *Das Archiv des Nephros und verwandte Texte, I: Das Archiv des Nephros: Papyri aus der Trierer und der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*, hrsg. u. komm. von B.K. und J.C.S. mit zwei kopt. Beitr. von G.M. Browne; II: *Verwandte Texte aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*, hrsg. u. komm. von B.K. (Aegypt. Trever. 4, Mainz am Rhein)

Kramer, Johannes

- 1994 — 'Papyrologie und Sprachwissenschaft: die Pionierzeit (1891-1906)', in *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen 23-29 August, 1992*, collected by A. Bülow-Jacobsen (Copenhagen) 71-80
- 1996 — 'I glossari tardo-antichi di tradizione papiracea', in *Les Manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du Moyen Âge. Actes du Colloque international organisé par le "Ettore Majorana Centre for Scientific Culture" (Erice, 23-30 sept. 1994)*, éd. par J. Hamesse (Textes et Ét. du Moyen Âge 4, Louvain-la-Neuve) 23-55

Krüger, Julian

- 1990 — *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit. Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption* (Europ. Hochschulschr. iii 441, Frankfurt)

Lama, Mariachiara

- 1991 — 'Aspetti di tecnica libraria ad Ossirinco: copie letterarie su rotoli documentari', *Aegyptus* 71 (1991) 55-120

Latte, Kurt

- 1915 — 'Zur Zeitbestimmung des Antiatticista', *Hermes* 50 (1915) 373-394 (= *Kleine Schriften zu Religion, Recht, Literatur und Sprache der Griechen und Römer*, hrsg. von O.Gigon - W. Buchwald - W. Kunkel [Munich 1968] 612-630)

Bibliography

Lewis, Naphtali

- 1981 — 'Literati in the Service of Roman Emperors: Politics before Culture', in L. Casson - M. Price (edd.), *Coins, Culture, and History in the Ancient World. Numismatic and Other Studies in Honor of Bluma L. Trell* (Detroit) 149-166 (= Lewis 1995, 257-274)
- 1995 — *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt. Collected Papers of Naphtali Lewis* (Am. St. Pap. 33, Atlanta)

Linnér, Sture

- 1943 — *Syntaktische und lexicalische Studien zur Historia Lausiaca des Palladios* (Diss. Uppsala)

Ljungvik, Herman

- 1926 — *Studien zur Sprache der apokryphen Apostelgeschichten* (Diss. Uppsala)
- 1932 — *Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgriechischen Volkssprache* (Skrifter utg. av K. Human. Vet.-Samf. i Uppsala 27.3, Uppsala-Leipzig)
- 1933 — 'Einige Bemerkungen zur spätgriechischen Syntax, *Aegyptus* 13 (1933) 159-168

Lobeck, Chr. August

- 1820 — *Phrynichi Eclogae nominum et verborum Atticorum, . . . ed., expl. Chr.A.L.* (Leipzig, repr. Hildesheim 1965)

Luiselli, Raffaele

- 1997 — 'Un nuovo manuale di epistolografia di epoca bizantina (P. Berol. inv. 21190). Presentazione e considerazioni preliminari', in B. Kramer - W. Luppe - H. Maehler - G. Poethke (edd.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.-19. 8. 1995, II* (APF Beiheft 3, Stuttgart-Leipzig) 643-651

Maas, Paul

- 1902 — 'Rhythmisches zu der Kunstprosa des Konstantinos Manasses', *ByzZ* 11 (1902) 505-512 (= Maas 1973, 426-434)
- 1973 — *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von W. Buchwald (Munich)

Mac Coull, Leslie S.B.

- 1988 — *Dioscorus of Aphroditos: His Work and His World* (The Transform. of the Class. Herit. 16, Berkeley-Los Angeles - London)

Bibliography

Maehler, Herwig

- 1983 — 'Die griechische Schule im ptolemäischen Ägypten', in E. van 'T Dack - P. van Dessel - W. van Gucht (edd.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven 24-26 May 1982* (Studia Hellenistica 27, Louvain) 191-203
- 1990 — 'Zur Datierung griechischer Buchschriften des 4. bis 8. Jahrhunderts aus Ägypten', in D. Harlfinger - G. Prato (a c. di), *Paleografia e codicologia greca. Atti del II Colloquio internazionale* (Berlin-Wolfenbüttel, 17-21 ottobre 1983) (Biblioteca di S & C 3, Alessandria) 31-40
- 1997 — 'Byzantine Egypt: Urban Élites and Book Production', *Dialogos* 4 (1997) 118-136

Maidhof, Adam

- 1912 — *Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Koine besonders auf Grund des attizisten Moiris* (Beiträge z. hist. Syntax d. gr. Sprache 20, Würzburg)

Malherbe, Abraham J.

- 1988 — *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (Society of Biblical Literature - Sources for Biblical Study 19, Atlanta)

Mandilaras, Basil G.

- 1972 — *Studies in the Greek Language. Some Aspects of the Development of the Greek Language up to the Present Day* (Athens)
- 1973 — *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* (Athens)

Marcotte, Didier - Mertens, Paul

- 1990 — 'Les papyrus de Callimaque', in M. Capasso et al. (a c. di), *Miscellanea papyrologica in occasione del bicentenario dell' edizione della Charta Borgiana*, II (Pap. Flor. 19, Florence)

Marrou, Henri-Irénée

- 1965 — *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, 6^e éd. (Paris)

Martín, Fernando

- 1982 — *La documentación griega de la cancellería del emperador Adriano* (Pamplona)

Martin, Josef

- 1974 — *Antike Rhetorik. Technik und Methode* (Handb. d. Alt.-wiss. II 3, Munich)

Matino, Giuseppina

- 1986 — *Lingua e pubblico nel Tardo antico. Ricerche sul greco letterario dei secoli IV-VI* (Speculum, Naples)

Mazza, Roberta

- 1997 — *L'Archivio degli Apioni. Rapporti tra Stato e grandi proprietà nell'Egitto tardoantico e bizantino* (Doctoral Diss. Univ. of Bologna)

Bibliography

Meecham, Henry G.

- 1935 — *The Letter of Aristeas. A Linguistic Study with Special Reference to the Greek Bible* (Publ. of the Univ. of Manchester 241, Manchester)

Meillet, Antoine

- 1965 — *Aperçu d' une histoire de la langue grecque*, 7^e éd. (Paris)

Mette, Hans Joachim

- 1952 — *Parateresis. Untersuchungen zur Sprachtheorie des Krates von Pergamon* (Halle)

Meyer, Paul M.

- 1930 — 'Die *Epistula Severi Alexandri* Dig. XLIX. 1,25 = P. Oxy. XVII. 2104', in *Studi in onore di Pietro Bonfante nel XL anno d' insegnamento*, II (Milan) 341-344

Michaelis, Wilhelm

- 1923 — 'Der Attizismus und das Neue Testament', *ZNTW* 22 (1923) 91-121

Millar, Fergus

- 1992 — *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC - AD 337)*, 2nd ed. (London)

van Minnen, Peter

- 1994 — 'House-to-House Enquiries: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Roman Karanis', *ZPE* 100 (1994) 227-251

Montevocchi, Orsolina

- 1988 — *La papirologia*, ristampa riv. e corr. con addenda (Milan)

Morgan, Teresa

- 1995 — 'Dionysius Thrax and the Educational Uses of Grammar', in V. Law - I. Sluiter (edd.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē* (The Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics 1, Münster) 73-94

Morpurgo-Tagliabue, G.

- 1980 — *Demetrio: dello stile* (Filologia e Critica 35, Rome)

Moscadi, Alessandro

- 1970 — 'Le lettere dell' archivio di Teofane', *Aegyptus* 50 (1970 = *Raccolta di scritti in onore di A. Calderini*, IV) 88-154

Moulton, James Hope

- 1901 — 'Grammatical Notes from the Papyri', *CR* 15 (1901) 31-38, 434-442
1904 — 'Grammatical Notes from the Papyri', *CR* 15 (1904) 106-112, 151-155

Muraoka, Takamitsu

- 1964-65 — 'The Use of ὥς in the Greek Bible', *NT* 7 (1964-65) 51-72

Naldini, Mario

- 1998 — *Il Cristianesimo in Egitto. Lettere private nei papiri dei secoli II-IV*, nuova ed. ampliata e aggiornata (Biblioteca Patristica 32, Florence)

Bibliography

Naoumides, Mark

- 1969 — 'The Fragments of Greek Lexicography in the Papyri', in *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry by His Students and Colleagues at the University of Illinois, 1924-1960* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 58, Urbana-Chicago-London) 181-202

Nicolai, Roberto

- 1992 — *La storiografia nell' educazione antica* (Biblioteca di MD 10, Pisa)

Norden, Eduard

- 1958 — *Die antike Kunstprosa vom 6. Jahrhundert bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, I-II, 5., unveränd. Aufl. (Darmstadt)

O' Callaghan, Josep

- 1963 — *Cartas cristianas griegas del siglo V* (Bibl. Hist. de la Bibl. Balmes ii 25, Barcelona)

Oguse, A.

- 1957 — 'Le Papyrus grec de Strasbourg 364+16', *Aegyptus* 37 (1950) 77-88

Oliver, James H.

- 1989 — *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri* (Amer. Philos. Soc. - Memoirs 178, Philadelphia)

Olsson, Bror

- 1925 — *Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römerzeit* (Uppsala)

Palmieri, Vincenzo

- 1988 — *Herennius Philo. De diversis verborum significationibus* (Speculum, Naples)

Papanikolaou, Antonios Dem.

- 1973 — *Chariton-Studien. Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Romane* (Hypomnemata 37, Göttingen)

Parsons, Peter J.

- 1970 — 'A School-Book from the Sayce Collection', *ZPE* 6 (1970) 133-49
1976 — 'Petitions and a letter: the Grammarian's Complaint', in A.E. Hanson (ed.), *Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts Published in Honor of H.C. Youtie, II* (PTA 20, Bonn) 409-446

Pernot, Hubert

- 1927 — *Études sur la langue des Évangiles* (Paris)

Pflaum, H.G.

- 1960-1961 — *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romaine*, I-III (IFAB - Bibl. Arch. et Hist. 57, Paris)
1982 — *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le haut-empire romaine. Supplément* (IFAPO - Bibl. Arch. et Hist. 112, Paris)

Bibliography

Pierson, J.

1831 — *Moeridis Atticistae lexicon Atticum* (Leipzig)

Psaltis, Stamatios B.

1913 — *Grammatik der Byzantinischen Chroniken* (Forsch. z. griech. u. latein. Gramm. 2, Göttingen; 2., unveränd. Aufl., Göttingen 1974)

Rabe, Hugo

1909 — 'Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften, 9. Griechische Briefsteller', *RhM* 64 (1909) 284-309

Radermacher, Ludwig

1925 — *Neutestamentliche Grammatik. Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache*, 2., erw. Aufl. (Handbuch z. Neuen Testament 1, Tübingen)

1947 — *Koine* (SAWW 224.5, Vienna)

Raffaelli, Lucia M.

1984 — 'Repertorio dei papiri contenenti scholia minora in Homerum', in *Ricerche di filologia classica*, II. *Filologia e critica letteraria della grecità* (Bibl. di Studi Antichi 45, Pisa)

Rahlfs, Alfred

1911 — *Septuaginta-Studien*, III. *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher* (Göttingen)

Rea, John R.

1993 — 'A Student's Letter to his Father: P.Oxy. XVIII 2190 Revised', *ZPE* 99 (1993) 75-88

1996 — 'P.Ant. I 44 Revised', *Tyche* 11 (1996) 187-193

Reardon, B.P.

1971 — *Courants littéraires grecs des II^e et III^e siècles après J.-C.* (Ann. Litt. de l'Univ. de Nantes 3, Paris)

Reed, Jeffrey T.

1997 — 'The Epistle', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. - A.D. 400* (Leiden - New York - Cologne) 171-193

Reitzenstein, Richard

1897 — *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz* (Leipzig, repr. Amsterdam 1964)

Reynolds, Joyce

1982 — *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London)

Rist, J.M.

1964 — 'Demetrius the Stylist and Artemon the Compiler', *Phoenix* 18 (1964) 2-8

Bibliography

Rutherford, W. Gunion

- 1881 — *The New Phrynichus, Being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus*, with introds. and comm. by W.G.R. (London, repr. Hildesheim 1968)

Rydbeck, Lars

- 1967 — *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament. Zur Beurteilung der sprachlichen Niveauunterschiede im nachklassischen Griechisch* (Acta Univ.Upsal. - Stud. Gr.Upsal. 5, Uppsala)

Said, S.

- 1991 — 'Ελληνισμός. *Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 25-27 oct. 1989*, éd. par S. Said (Univ. des Sciences Hum. de Strasb. - Trav. du Centre de Rech. sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce Ant. 11, Leiden)

Saija, Ausilia

- 1978 — 'La metrica di Dioscoro di Afroditopoli', in E. Livrea - G.A. Privitera (edd.), *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni*, II (Rome) 825-845

Salonius, A.H.

- 1927 — *Zur Sprache der griechischen Papyrusbriefe, 1. Die Quellen* (Soc. Scient. Fenn. - Comment. Human. Litt. 2.3, Helsingfors)

Schenkeveld, Dirk Marie

- 1964 — *Studies in Demetrius On Style* (Amsterdam)
1994 — 'Scholarship and Grammar', in *La Philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine*, Entr. prép. et prés. par F. Montanari (Entr. sur l'Ant. Class. 40, Geneva) 263-301

Schmidt, Hermann

- 1893 — *De duali Graecorum et emorientis et reviviscentis* (Bresl. Philol. Abh. 6.4, Breslau)

Schmitt, Rüdiger

- 1977 — *Einführung in die griechischen Dialekte* (Die Alt.-wiss., Darmstadt)

Schubart, Wilhelm

- 1918 — *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (Berlin)

Schulz, Fritz

- 1961 — *Geschichte der römischen Rechtswissenschaft* (Weimar)

Schweizer [Schwyzer], Eduard

- 1898 — *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften. Beiträge zur Laut- und Flexionslehre der gemeingriechischen Sprache* (Berlin)

Bibliography

Schwyzler, Eduard

- 1901 — 'Die griechischen Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus', *NJA* 7 (1901) 233-248

Serz, H.

- 1920 — *Der Infinitiv in den griechischen Papyri der Kaiserzeit (von Augustus bis Diokletian)* (Diss. Erlangen)

Ševčenko, Ihor

- 1981a — 'Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose', *JÖB* 31.1 (1981 = *XVI. Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress, Wien, 4.-9. Okt. 1981, Akten I* 1) 289-312
1981b — 'Additional Remarks to the Report on Levels of Style', *JÖB* 32.1 (1981 = *XVI. Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress, Wien, 4.-9. Okt. 1981, Akten II* 1) 220-238

Shelton, John C.

- 1981 — 'The Archive of Papnuthis and Dorotheus', in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XLVIII*, ed. with translations and notes by M. Chambers *et al.* (Gr.-Rom. Mem. 67, London) 74-145

Shipp, G.P.

- 1979 — *Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary* (Sydney)

Siebenborn, Elmar

- 1976 — *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik* (Stud. z. ant. Philos. 5, Amsterdam)

Sijpesteijn, Pieter J.

- 1976 — 'A Happy Family?', *ZPE* 21 (1976) 169-181

Sijpesteijn, Pieter J. - Worp, Klaas A.

- 1978 — 'A Sixth "Narratio" Document', *BASP* 15 (1978 = *Studies Presented to Naphtali Lewis*) 115-123

Stahl, Johann(es) Matthias

- 1907 — *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit* (Indogermanische Bibliothek I i 4, Heidelberg)

Steinthal, Heymann

- 1890 & 1891 — *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Logik*, 2., verm. u. verb. Aufl., I-II (Berlin)

Stowers, Stanley K.

- 1986 — *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia)

Swain, Simon

- 1996 — *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250* (Oxford)

Bibliography

Sykutris, Johannes

- 1931 — 'Epistolographie', *RE* Suppl. V (1931) 185-220

Tabachovitz, David

- 1926 — *Sprachliche und textkritische Studien zur Chronik des Theophanes Confessor* (Diss. Uppsala)

- 1943 — *Études sur le grec de la basse époque* (Skrifter utg. av K. Human. Vet.-Samf. i Uppsala 36.3, Uppsala-Leipzig)

- 1946 — 'Phénomènes linguistiques du vieux grec dans le grec de la basse époque', *MH* 3 (1946) 144-179

- 1956 — *Die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament* (Skr. utg. av Svenska Inst. i Athen 8, 4, Lund)

Thackeray, H. St. John

- 1909 — *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint, I. Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge)

Thomas, George

- 1991 — *Linguistic Purism* (London-New York)

Thomas, J. David

- 1982 — *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, 2. The Roman Epistrategos* (Pap. Colon. 6, Cologne)

Thraede, Klaus

- 1970 — *Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Brieftopik* (Zetemata 48, Munich)

Thumb, Albert

- 1901 — *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der KOINH* (Strasbourg; repr. Berlin-New York 1974)

- 1906 — 'Die Prinzipienfragen der Koine-Forschung', *NJA* 17 (1906) 246-263

Tibiletti, G.

- 1979 — *Le lettere private nei papiri greci del III e IV secolo d.C.* (Scienze Filol. e Lett. 15, Milan)

Tomadakes, Nikolaos B.

- 1969-1970 — *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Βυζαντινὴν Φιλολογίαν, III. Βυζαντινὴ Ἐπιστολογραφία*, ἐκδ. τριτ. (Athens)

Tonnet, Henry

- 1988 — *Recherches sur Arrien, sa personnalité et ses écrits atticistes*, I-II (Amsterdam)

- 1993 — *Histoire du grec moderne. La formation d'une langue* (Paris)

Tosi, Renzo

- 1988 — *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci* (Univ. d. Studi di Bologna, Dip. di Filol. Class. e Med. - Studi di Filologia Greca 3, Bologna)

Bibliography

Trunk, J.

1911 — *De Basilio Magno sermonis Attici imitatore* (Stuttgart)

Turner, Eric G.

1952 — 'Roman Oxyrhynchus', *JEA* 38 (1952) 78-93

1980 — *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, 2nd enlarged ed. (Oxford)

Usener, Hermann

1907 — *Der heilige Tychon* (Sonderbare Heilige. Texte u. Unters. 1, Leipzig-Berlin)

Veitch, William

1887 — *Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective. Their Forms, Meaning and Quantity, Embracing All the Tenses Used by the Greek Writers, with References to the Passages in which they are found* (Oxford, repr. Hildesheim 1967)

Versteegh, Kees

1986 — 'Latinitas, Hellenismos, 'Arabiyya', in D.J. Taylor (ed.), *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period* (Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 46, Amsterdam) 251-274

Völker, Franz

1900 — *Papyrorum Graecarum syntaxis specimen* (Diss. Bonn)

1903 — *Syntax der griechischen Papyri, I. Der Artikel* (Münster)

Voelz, James W.

1984 — 'The Language of the New Testament', in *ANRW* II 25.2 (1984) 893-977

Vogeser, Joseph

1907 — *Zur Sprache der griechischen Heiligenlegenden* (Diss. Munich)

Wackernagel, Jakob

1943 — 'Graeca', *Philologus* 95 (1943) 177-192 (= *Kleine Schriften*, II [Göttingen 1953] 876-891)

Wagner, Guy

1987 — *Les Oasis d' Égypte à l' époque grecque, romaine et byzantine d' après les documents grecs* (IFAO, Cairo)

Wahlgren, Staffan

1995 — *Sprachwandel im Griechisch der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit* (Acta Univ. Gothob. - Stud. Gr. et Lat. Gothob. 60, Gothenburg)

Way, Agnes Clare

1927 — *The Language and Style of the Letters of St. Basil* (The Catholic Univ. of America - Patristic Studies 13, D.Phil. Diss., Washington)

Weems, Sarah Molyneaux

1981 — *Greek Grammatical Papyri: The School Texts* (PhD Diss. University of Missouri, Columbia)

Bibliography

Weichert, V.

- 1910 — *Demetrii et Libanii qui feruntur Τύποι ἐπιστολικοί et Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτῆρες*, ed. V.W. (BT, Leipzig)

White, John L.

- 1986 — *Light from Ancient Letters* (Philadelphia)

Wifstrand, Albert

- 1952 — 'Det grekiska prosaspråket. En historisk översikt', *Eranos* 50 (1952) 149-163

Wilcken, Ulrich

- 1920 — 'Zu den Kaiserreskripten', *Hermes* 55 (1920) 1-42

Williams, Wynne

- 1974 — 'The *Libellus* Procedure and the Severan Papyri', *JRS* 64 (1974) 86-103
1975 — 'Formal and Historical Aspects of Two New Documents of Marcus Aurelius',
ZPE 17 (1975) 37-78

Wolff, H. J.

- 1961 — 'Der byzantinische Urkundenstil Ägyptens im Lichte der Funde von Nessana und Dura', *RIDA* s. iii, 8 (1961) 115-154

Worp, Klaas A.

- 1995 — *Greek Papyri from Kellis: I*, ed. by K.A. Worp in collaboration with J.E.G. Whitehorne and R.W. Daniel (Oxbow Monograph 54, Dakhleh Oasis Project - Monograph 3, Oxford)

Wouters, Alfons

- 1979 — *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt. Contributions to the Study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity* (Verhandel. van de Koninkl. Acad. voor Wetenschapp., Lett. en Schone Kunst. van België - Kl. der Lett., Jaarg. 41 nr. 92, Brussels)
1988 — *The Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499. A Graeco-Latin Lexicon on the Pauline Epistles and a Greek Grammar*, ed. by A.W. (Chester Beatty Monographs 12, Louvain - Paris)

Bibliography

Youtie, Herbert C.

- 1970 — 'Callimachus in the Tax Rolls', in D.H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 12-17 August 1968* (Am. Stud. Pap. 7, Toronto 1970) 545-551 (= Youtie 1973, 1035-41)
- 1971a — 'Ἀγράμματος: An Aspect of Greek Society in Egypt', *HSPh* 75 (1971) 161-176 (= Youtie 1973, 611-627)
- 1971b — 'Βραδέως γράφων: Between Literacy and Illiteracy', *GRBS* 12 (1971) 239-261 (= Youtie 1973, 629-651)
- 1973 — *Scriptiunculae* II (Amsterdam)
- 1975 — 'Ὑπογραφεύς: the Social Impact of Illiteracy in Graeco-Roman Egypt', *ZPE* 17 (1975) 201-221 (= Youtie 1981, 179-199)
- 1976 — 'Paniskos and his Wife's Name', *ZPE* 21 (1976) 193-196 (= Youtie 1981, 307-310)
- 1981 — *Scriptiunculae posteriores*, I-II (Bonn)

Zalateo, Giorgio

- 1940 — 'Papiri fiorentini inediti', *Aegyptus* 20 (1940) 7-14

Ziemann, Ferdinand

- 1911 — *De epistularum Graecarum formulis sollemnibus quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Halle)

Zilliacus, Henrik

- 1943 — *Zur Sprache griechischer Familienbriefe des III. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (P. Michigan 214-221) (Helsingfors)
- 1956 — 'Zum Stil und Wortschatz der byzantinischen Urkunden und Briefe', in *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Papyrologie, Wien 1955* (29 Aug. - 3 Sept.) (MPER N.S. 5, Vienna) 157-165
- 1967 — *Zur Abundanz der spätgriechischen Gebrauchssprache* (Soc. Scient. Fenn. - Comment. Human. Litt. 42.2, Helsinki - Helsingfors)

Zucker, Friedrich

- 1929-30 — 'Über Sprache und Stil frühbyzantinischer Urkunden', *ByzZ* 30 (1929-30) 146-155

